

SOME
REFLECTIONS

UPON THE
Opposition made against the Free
Doctrine of Mr. BAXTER:

PUT OUT
For the *Confirming* the Friends thereof,
and *Preventing* others from being Seduced into
Antinomianism, by contrary Teachers.

By a Lover of the Persons of all Parties, but
Addicted to no Party.
John Humfrey

Bos lassus fortius figit pedem.

LONDON,

Printed for Tho. Parkhurst at the Bible and Three Crowns
near Mercers-Chappel in Cheapside, and J. Robinson at
the Golden Lyon in St. Pauls Church-yard, 1700.

2014

REVISIONS

THE

Operation of the
Revision of the

PUT OUT

For the Commission
and the Commission
by county leaders

of a Board of
Advisors of all

the Commission

FOR

the Commission
the Commission
the Commission

Some Reflections

On the Doctrine of Mr. Baxter as it is Opposed

SECT. I.

THERE is a late Book called *Alexipharmacum*, writ by one, who appears by the Title, *Physician and Divine*, and is ordinarily called *Doctor*, (and therefore so will I call him) and set forth against *Bishop Salkingfleet*, *Mr. Hunsley*, and *Mr. Clark*, who having a professed Enmity against the Doctrine of Mr. Baxter, he hath devised a Name to give it, which I confess, I like well enough in regard to what it opposes; that is, the Name of *Neonomianism*, in opposition to *Antinomianism*; but I do not approve of his Character of it, when he tells us that *the Genuine and proper Nature thereof does lie in setting aside of the Righteousness of Christ, and the imputation thereof to the justification of the Sinner before God, and to advance the inherent Righteousness of Man into the room and place thereof*.

In which Description, here is in the first place, a manifest Wrong he does us, in saying we lay aside the *Righteousness of Christ* in the justification of the Sinner; when he, and all Men knows, that we make it the *Meritorious Cause* (which is as it were the *all in all*, as to the Matter) of our *Justification*: And when he says farther, that we lay aside the *Imputation* of it, he wrongs us also; for we own an *Imputation*, *Quo ad fructus aut*

effectus, which is such as does serve all purposes of the Gospel, so that there needs no more, for if God does impute Christ's Righteousness to the Believer so far, as that his Sin is pardoned and his Soul saved; What were he the better to be accounted, also to have obeyed and suffered in him, which is a thing that is not so, and God cannot account it so. And therefore it is true, that as to an *Imputation in Se*, we do after Mr. Baxter depart from the common Doctrine thereof, formerly received, and for this Reason, because an *Imputation in Se* does suppose that Christ in his Obedience and Sufferings, did act as our *Legal Person*, so that God does look on us to have obeyed and suffered in Him, and consequently, that His Righteousness thereupon does become our proper Righteousness, whereby we are *formally* justified. This Opinion, being in Mr. Baxter's Judgment, and other Learned Mens, found really absurd, and leading necessarily to *Antinomianism*, Mr. Baxter, and his Followers do leave to this zealously affected Author, and such as he, who tho' they see the *Antinomian* consequences, will yet hold it, tho' they swallow *Antinomianism* with it. They who say that Christ's Righteousness is so imputed to us, as that God reputes Christ to have obeyed and suffered, though not in our Natural, yet in the Legal or Civil Person of the Sinner or Believer, as their strict and proper Representative, and so to have our selves fulfilled all Righteousness in Him, or by Him, do heinously err, and subvert the Gospel. So Mr. Baxter in his *End of Controversies*, and all his Books.

Nevertheless, for the preventing (in the beginning) of future Cavil, and more false Accusation, I must say, that when we own Christ's Righteousness to be the Meritorious Cause of our Justification, and that it is imputed in its effects, as we must, we do own, that it is imputed to us as the Meritorious Cause; that is, though not *in se*, yet in its Causality, or as it bears a causal Relation to these Effects.

As for the rest of the Description, it is still a continued Abuse, as if we gave our *Gospel Righteousness* the Place and

Office

Office of *Christ's Righteousness*; which there is no Man more careful to avoid than Mr. *Baxter*, who for this end does declare that this Righteousness of the Evangelick condition, is but a *Subordinate* Righteousness to *Christ's Righteousness*: That is, it is, *Christ's Righteousness* hath merited and procured the Pardon of Sin, and our Acceptation to Life upon the Terms of the Gospel; and our *Evangelick Righteousness*, that is Faith and Repentance being those Terms, they are required in order to our having *Christ's Righteousness* imputed to us in regard to those *Effects*, when in *Se* it is *His* onely, and can never be *Ours*. This is his Doctrine I think, and there is yet this farther in it; that the *Right* to Pardon and Life, the *Jus ad impunitatem & vitam*, which *Christ* hath procured for us upon our Believing, (he counts) a Righteousness also which the Believer hath, together with the Righteousness of his Faith; or rather, does go into (as a part of) that Righteousness for which his Faith is imputed. If there be any thing more in the many and various Expressions and deeper Thoughts, which Mr. *Baxter* hath in his Books, about this Subject, I am willing to learn it of others.

Thus much I stand upon; and there is one thing to this purpose, I cannot but observe in this Sagacious Dr. (being one that is true to his own Thoughts) that in his dealing with the *Bishop*, for the proof of *Christ's* Sufferings to be a proper Punishment against Mr. *Baxter*, he does very forwardly maintain, that *Christ* in bearing our Sins, did not only take on him the Punishment, but the Guilt; the Personal Guilt, the Guilt of the Fault, and expressly the Desert, which is more than can be born by the *Bishop*, and others; yet when he comes to the point, whether in the Eye of the Law, or in God's Account, *Christ* is to be lookt on as a Sinner; his Conscience reluctates, and he dares not affirm it. To be a Criminal, or Sinner, is to perpetrate the Fact, (he says) which *Christ* did not. Now, when this Dr. could without scruple proceed to assert *Christ's* taking on him the De-

sere

few it self of our Sins, because it is but by *Imputation*; I cannot but observe it as a providentially strange thing, that he should scruple the going on, and strain at the owning Christ's Being *Legally* a *Sinner* also, when others (he knows) ordinarily say it; and he quotes Mr. *Stephens* saying for a *Text*, that he was the *greatest Sinner by Imputation*. This check arising from his own Conscience, does in effect retract what he asserted; and I must take notice, that to come to this result, that there is such a *Communion of Persons* between the *Believer* and *Christ*; that our Lord in the Person of the Believer, is the *Sinner*, and the Believer, in the Person of Christ, is the *Righteous*, even the Righteous in his Righteousness which formally justifies him, is so hard to be swallowed, that an *Antinomian* himself, or least, an almost *Antinomian* may well make a stand at it.

SECT. XI.

BY the way, I cannot but think it fit to take notice, that the Bishop and the Doctor both have overlooked what, which alone can, and does reconcile the Difference which hath been agitated among the Dissenting Ministers, about the great Point of *Satisfaction*. The common, and most received Opinion, which Mr. *Lobb* undertook to maintain, is, That Christ's Sufferings was a *proper Punishment*, and our Sins the *Meritoribus Cause* of it; as if otherwise, there could be no *Satisfaction*. But Mr. *Baxter* accounts, that the Sins being ours, they cannot merit any Punishment but upon our selves, and that Christ's Sufferings therefore were *Materially*, not *Formally* Punishment, and consequently, no *proper Punishment*. Punishment is an Infliction of a natural Evil on a Person for committing a moral Evil: But Christ never committed any moral Evil; and when there are *Sufferings* without *Desert*, how can they be *proper formal Punishment*? Besides, the Bishop himself asserts this, that *No Man can cause to deserve Punishment*

punishment for his own Faults, nor deserve that another should be
 punished for him. On the other side, 'tis true, That Christ
 Dyed for Sinners; that he Dyed in their stead; that in our
 room He bare the Punishment we deserved; that the Punish-
 ment we deserved, is our Punishment; that our Punishment,
 and which we deserved, is a proper Punishment; that this
 Punishment is due to us by virtue of the Sanction of the Law
 violated by us, and our Sins, the Meritorious Cause of it.
 It is true also, that *Gratius* sets himself *de industria* to prove
 the same; to wit, that our Sins were the *Impulsive*, the Me-
 ritorious Impulsive Cause, and not the *Final*, as the *Socinians*
 would have, of the Punishment: And how then can Mr.
Baxter be reconciled to *Gratius*, and Mr. *Williams*, who vin-
 dicates him to Mr. *Lobb*; and indeed the Bishop to himself?
 For in his Book of the *Sufferings of Christ*, he does say, that
His Sufferings were a proper Punishment, which made Mr. *Lobb*
 appeal to him; and yet he says here, That no Man can deserve,
 that another should be punished for his Faults. How then, I say,
 could any Reconciliation be made, (Especially, such as that
 All shall agree in common, against *Socinianism*, and neither be
 in the wrong) if *Gratius* himself had not made it? There is
 one Word passed by *Gratius* (Not observed by the Dr. tho' I
 believe he hath read him, for else he would have had his
 Exceptions; whether by the Bishop or no, I cannot judge)
 which is so fortunately judicious, or judiciously fortunate, as
 does effectually serve this purpose. I will give it in the pas-
 sage it self of *Gratius*, where *Socius* having said, That *Reator*
Dei & ipse Christi voluntatem, non posse ullam causam legit-
nam reddi mortis Christi nisi dicamus Christum meritum fuisse
 (Let the Dr. consider this, who will have Christ take on
 Him the Desert, as well as the Punishment of our Sins) *ut mo-*
riveretur: He gives him this brisk Answer; *Neque quidem in An-*
tecedente causa meritum, sed Impersonaliter. That Word *Imper-*
sonaliter is the Word, a Word that seems as it were dropt
avulsi into his Mind to do our business. There are instances
 alledged

alleged out of Scripture; *David* commiteth Adultery, and his Child dyes; *David* numbers the People, and the Pestilence falls on the People; *Saul* oppresses the *Gibeonites*, and his Grandchildren suffer; and so for *Abah*, *Manasseh*, and the like; where it is apparent, that the Sin and Desert lies in one person, and yet the Punishment is inflicted on another; & this being of God's doing or Approbation, it must be just: The case is the same here; it is we that sinned, and deserved the Punishment; yet, the Punishment it self is laid on Christ, and being with his consent, is not unjust. Here then we see a double *Merit* of Punishment, *Personal* and *Impersonal*: *Impersonaliter* Christ's Sufferings as due to us, are a proper Punishment, Punishment for Sin as the meritorious Cause of it, and arising from the Sanction of the Law, which, if we had born them, had been executed by it: But *Personaliter*, as they are inflicted on Christ instead of us; they arise not from Sin as the meritorious Cause, nor from the Obligation of the Law, and are no Execution of it. The Punishment was our Punishment; the Curse our Curse; the Law our Law; but the Obligation (being Personal) not our Obligation, but another. Our Obligation, was *Obligatio criminis ex delicto*; this only, *ex voluntario contractu*, which is true with our Divines. The Observation of this Word of *Grotius*, is made by Mr. *H.* in his *Ultima Manus*, and prosecuted there at large, from whence I take it, unto which I therefore refer the Reader; And thus much I mention for this end, that there being something wanting in the Conclusion of that Book of Mr. *H.* that was not Printed, because wrote too late, I may have occasion to supply it here, upon his desire, seeing it cannot be done otherwise, which I find in these words of his own, following.

It is, I will apprehend, a kind of generous Notion, this of *Grotius*, that it is enough that our Sins were meritorious of Punishment indefinitely, as to Christ, and in God's laying it on him to make Christ's Sufferings such a Punishment
(whether

whether *proper* or not) as suffices to satisfaction: And it is a narrow, poor, and kind of envious thing in *Socinus* and *Crellius* to stand upon it, that unless the Merit were *Personal*, it is no *proper Punishment*, and without that, no Satisfaction. As for Mr. *Baxter*, he professes that the Sufferings of Christ were no *proper Punishment*, and that a *Vicarious Punishment* is sufficient to satisfaction. But as for Mr. *Lobb* and the common Doctrine, it is at that low water with them, as to stand with *Socinus* to have his *proper Punishment* necessary to *Satisfaction*, and yet stand against *Socinus* for the Doctrine of it. And how will they be ever able to come off without this of *Grotius*, that *Impersonaliter*, it may be granted?

It is true, as is signified, that *Socinus* requires some antecedent Cause of the Death of Christ, besides God's Will, and His own voluntary Spouson; and that such as by Reason thereof, He in his own Person *Definite & Legitime* ought to suffer, or else he will not allow satisfaction to be made by it; and *Crellius* therefore does account of *Grotius* his Merit *impersonaliter*, to be *Nihil ad rem*, That is indeed nothing to him, whom nothing will serve for Christ's making satisfaction, less, than such a Merit of Suffering, personally affecting himself, as he is certainly incapable of, and consequently be such a *Postulatum*, as must make *satisfaction* impossible: But this Nothing to him, is a most considerable Matter to us, in regard to the difficulty of the Point. The Church of Christ hath owned this Doctrine of Satisfaction; that is, a satisfaction made by Christ's Death, for the atoning God's Wrath against Sin, that we may be Pardoned; which we must apprehend to be such therefore as can be made, and satisfaction lying not in the executing the Law, but in rendring an equivalent *loco debiti*, (as the Schools have it) it is agreeable, that our Sins be accordingly held *Loco causæ meritorie*; and what then can be more appositely said upon that account than this of *Grotius*, That in antecedente mortis Christi causa fuit meritum, sed Impersonaliter? For as for *Crellius*'s telling us farther, that a Merit

tum impersonaliter, is not to be yielded to *Grotius*, understanding him, as if he meant, that our Sins could merit a Punishment indefinitely, and not the punishing the Persons themselves that have sinned (which is indeed an *Id falsissimum*, but of his own conception) he is to take *Grotius* in his due sense, and understanding that our Sins having merited a Punishment to be inflicted, and that on our selves; it was Christ, that in our behalf (as our Interceder or Peace-maker) took on him the Punishment without the Merit of it; the Punishment I say, which was ours *Impersonaliter*, and not ours *Personaliter* (so I have it in my Book in two places) as the Merit was ours Personally, and his Impersonally, and so made satisfaction to God for our escaping eternal Damnation.

To set all then at right at last in the Controversy: *Vera satisfactio* (according to *Socinus* and *Crellius*) is *plena debiti persolutio*. But in Christ's Sufferings there was not *plena debiti persolutio*. Ergo with the *Socinian*, no *Satisfactio*. This is *Socinianism* in the sum as to this Point. In opposition hereunto; on the one side, Mr. *Lobb* grants the *Major*, and in effect stands upon it; but denies the *Minor*, which the *Socinian* holds Negatively, and *He* Affirmatively: On the other side, Mr. *Baxter* grants the *Minor*, as what is not to be gain-said, but denies the *Major*; which the *Socinian* holds Affirmatively, and *He* Negatively. That this is, and how this is a true Account, as to the Arguings of the one and the other, you must see in my Book. Now, when both one and the other affirms what *Socinus* denies, and denies what *Socinus* affirms in one of the Premises, thus far I may safely determine my self, that neither Mr. *Lobb*, nor Mr. *Williams* in his holding with Mr. *Baxter*, is to be accused of *Socinianism*: But which of the Ways is to be chosen as most accurate; or which of the Propositions is to be denied, or allowed, as most defensible for maintaining the Doctrine of the *Orthodox*, it will become me to leave, as a thing in the solid Judgment whereof, does lye the very business of that more, and most suffici-

ent Moderator, unto whom Mr. *Williams* and Mr. *Loeb* have appealed.

This was written at the time when such a *Decission* was intended and expected by, and from Bishop *Stillingfleet* while living and well, and which now after his Death is made known by some peice or beginning thereof in an unfinish'd Book, which I could not read, but with praise, with grief, and with vexation. With praise, in regard to the Design which was so worthy of a Bishop, so condescending and good: With grief, and sorrow, submissive to God's hand, that the Bishop should dye before he had accomplish'd this Work so much desired: With vexation, to be so disappointed of his Determination. The Points are named and undertaken wherein I sought satisfaction, but not come to, by reason of Sickness and Death; and yet is this imperfect Book printed, which is a thing should not have been, upon the account of very *Wrong*, and that both to the *Reader*, who buyes something, and has not the Commodity he thought he had bought; and to the *Bishop*, who having not *sold*, and much less *explicated* his Notions, he is exposed to Adversaries, (as to this Dr.) and his Friends know not here what he would be at, to stand up for his Vindication.

SECT. III.

THUS much in the second Section, being a Digression (tho' not altogether so, because necessary.) I will return to the matter of the first Section. For as our Sins in the merit of them cannot be Christ's, yet he bore them as His in their Effect, which is Punishment: So Christ's Righteousness in the Merit, can never be ours, (*in se* ours), the Merit remains His, but it is ours in its Effects, and I proceed accordingly.

In the *Fifth* to the *Romans*, we read of the Imputation of *Adam's Sin* to his Posterity, by which we interpret that of

Christ's Righteousness. Now, how is *Adam's Sin* imputed to us? Is it imputed *in Se?* Are we accounted to have sinned in *Adam*, and so to be Sinners? Does the Dr, or can he think that God looks on us as those that perpetrated the Fact, that eat the Apple? The *Ninth Article* of the *Church of England*, speaks nothing of our Sinning in *Adam* by Eating, but places Original Sin altogether in the Corruption we derive from him, which it says hath the *nature of Sin*, and *deserveth Damnation*. I suppose the Dr. of the same mind, seeing upon the Point of Christ bearing our Sins, he does not say as his Brethren, that Christ therefore was *by Imputation a Sinner*. He must apprehend accordingly, as to the Imputation of *Adam's Sin*. It is *imputed*, that is certain; for in *Adam* we all Dye; that is imputed *que ad Effectus*, seeing Death does pass from him upon us all. His Sin in the Eating it self, is not ours, *Actiones sunt suppositorum*, but the Effect, Death, is ours, which I understand too, not to come but through the Mediation of our own Sin; to wit, the original Corruption, I say, derived from him; and if it were not for that, I see not how the Effect of Death was to be lookt on as a Punishment to us. Indeed, we all in our First Parents being excluded the Tree of Life upon *Adam's Transgression*, must Dye without remedy; if not as a Punishment to us, yet as a fruit of his Sin. Some Divines do say, we sinned in *Adam*, as *Levi paid Tithes in Abraham*; but I conceive not so: for tho' *Levi* might be said to act in *Abraham* Physically, and we to eat, and do what *Adam* did Physically (as being in their loins), yet not Morally. *Levi* did neither good nor evil in what *Abraham* did; nor we, in what *Adam* did, because in their loins. For the Scripture speaking of *Jacob* and *Esau* before they were Born, and saying, *The Children being not yet Born, neither having done good or evil*, includes, no doubt, that they could in that state be capable of neither. To say *Adam* was our Proxy, if you lay the matter there, when of God's own Appointment, and not ours, is to make him the cause of Childrens

from Damnation: And therefore those words, *et cetera* ~~translatio~~ are well Translated, *For that*, and not *In whom all have sinned*; all Adam's Posterity being defiled by Birth, and so for that, which is in themselves, called *Sin* more than once by the *Apostle*, becoming guilty of Death and Damnation, according to the *Article* mentioned. Let us come then to these words in the place: *As by the Disobedience of one Man, many (yea all) were made Sinners*; that is, in regard to this Effect, that *Death reigns over all since Adam*: So by the Obedience of one Man, are many made *Righteous*, as to the effect of eternal Life, as it follows, and is explained in the next Verse. *That as Sin reigned unto Death, so might Grace reign through Righteousness unto eternal Life in Christ Jesus*. We are not made actual Sinners (I say) by Adam's actual Transgression, nor actually Righteous in Christ's Righteous Actions; but we are *Sinners* in regard to the fruit of Adam's Sin; that is, *Death*; and *Righteous*, in reaping the Fruits of Christ's Righteousness, such as Pardon and eternal Life.

I say the same as to that parallel Text; *He made him Sin, that knew no Sin*: He did not make him formally a *Sinner*, though he bare our Sin as to the Punishment according to this Dr, and consequently, we are not made formally *Righteous in his Righteousness*; but we are made the *Righteousness of God in him*, or through him, in partaking the benefits of his Righteousness, or in the *Imputation* of it to us in its Effects. Let more Texts be named, they must be so understood, as that in the Prophet, *The Lord our Righteousness*: Not that he puts on us his Righteousness, which cannot be; but he imputes it in regard to the benefits we have by it. The Effects are ours *really*, and his Righteousness *relatively* in regard to those effects, and no otherwise. This is the whole of the matter, as Mr. H. has it in his *Animadversions on Mr. Williams's two last Books*; and I say the same to this Dr, and count it an Answer to the main of his Book.

And having mentioned the Reverend Mr. Williams, and those

those *Animadversions*, I hope that by this time that worthy Brother (if he be one, as I believe, that prefers the investigation of Truth, and following of Peace, above his interest) does see reason to take the same in good part; for, seeing the whole cause of Mr. Baxter, and his followers, must stand or fall upon the Point in hand, that is, of an *Imputation in Se*, which this Dr. maintains, and we deny; and in the sense, the Dr. maintains it, Mr. Williams after Mr. Baxter does deny the same as well as we; and yet being baited by the Brethren for it, he was so much concerned as to set himself to the inventing a new *Imputation in Se*, not before thought on by any; which being of dangerous consequence, both in respect to the bringing in any new thing into the Article of Justification, so much perplexed already, and also the making a Division between Mr. Baxter's Followers, if any of our Brethren should follow his Invention, Mr. H. may expect from him, and his friends, their thanks for his preventing such a Mischief, rather than continue any Displeasure against him for the writing that Book, upon so necessary Occasion.

Mr. Baxter was the Man, that seeing the whole strength of the *Antinomian*, to depend on the conceit of Christ's acting in the Person of his *Elect*, so that God does look on them to have done and suffered what Christ did, and upon that account, to be Righteous (and that as he) and thereby justify, he made it his business in many Books to confute such Doctrine, as false and dangerous; this being indeed the *Imputation in Se*, which (I say) the Dr. maintains, and we deny. It pleased God to raise up that Man in this Nation, as Luther in Germany; and when the Land was over-run with *Antinomianism*, he made him the Instrument to mow it down, by the impugning this Doctrine, which the common Protestant had imbibed; and as that fell, by his sinking the Credit thereof, so if this Dr. can raise up that Credit again, he is like to revive also *Antinomianism* with it. I can not therefore, but request Mr. Williams, as the Man most fit for the Defence of that

that Cause he was so much engaged in, and being prepared for answering what was left unanswered of Mr. *Lobb's*, and consequently whatsoever it farther said by this Dr, to return to that task that lyes upon him (especially seeing that excellent Moderator, Bishop *Stillingfleet* is taken away in the midst of his Endeavours), and finish the same to the satisfaction of such as have expected it from him.

SECT. IV.

There are two grounds (I account) upon which this *Imputation in Se* is built by our Divines, that maintain it, Christ's *Union with us*, and His *Mediation for us*. A third Account given by Mr. *Williams*, being peculiar to himself, as I have said, and not like to be followed, need no more but the mention.

For the first Account, or Ground of Christ's *Union with us*, I know that some great Divines do speak high, as if the Believer and Christ were but one Person, and so Christ's Righteousness to be his as one with him. *Fideles in unam personam coalescunt cum Christo, unde in eos ipsa suam transfert iustitiam, ut possint illam tanquam propriam ad justificationem obtinendam sibi applicare, & Deo offerre. Dignum de Just. Hab. C. 24.* It is the Righteousness of Christ, they say, which is imputed, and that an *Imputation in Se*. But how can it be the Righteousness of another, if it be made ours in *Se* by Imputation? Does Christ's Righteousness become Peter's personal Righteousness upon his Believing, or not? If not, how is it made *Hu in Se* by this Union? If it be, then is it the Righteousness of such a singular *suppositum rationale* (for that is a Person) and an Accident of that Subject, and how can that which is an Accident in Christ, become an Accident also in Peter, that is, either to migrate from one Subject to another, or to be one and the same Accident in two Subjects? The Question then is, whether here be not a false Suppo-

Supposition, that the Properties of *Christ* and *Peter*, by virtue of this Union, are communicated one to another; so that *Peter's* Sins must be transfer'd to *Christ*, and one *Righteousness* be made the *Personal* Righteousness of both? If they say there is no *Physical* Communication, but *Juridical*, or the like; why then do they not found their *Imputation* in Se upon the other Account, or Ground only? The Union which is between *Christ* and the Believer, is a *Real*, tho' *Mystical* Union; and if the *Communication* be not *Physical*, then is not (I say) this *Imputation* to be founded on this bottom, our *Union with Christ*. There is *Real Naturally*, and *Real Mystically*; *Christ's* Righteousness must be ours (I say) really, tho' mystically, if it be ours on this account; it must be given and received by Faith; and so be ours, not legally only, because imputed, but imputed, because ours really, and given to make us Righteous, and so be our formal Righteousness to justify us, if it be built on this Foundation. I will add, this Union we speak of, is a *substantial* Union; Divines say, it is indeed mystically such, as the Mind cannot conceive, or the Tongue express, but *substantial* it is. And if these Men will have *Christ's* Righteousness theirs upon this account, I see not why his Righteousness must not be ours, for our *Sanctification* as well as for our *Justification*. The same Scripture says he is made to us of God, *Wisdom* and *Sanctification*, as says he is made to us *Righteousness*. But there is none of them will say, that his *Wisdom* makes us Wise, or his *Holiness* sanctifies us. Nor can they say indeed, that His Righteousness makes us Righteous; that is *formally* Righteous to justify us. The Wife may have great benefits by her Husband's *Wisdom*, *Goodness*, *Righteousness*, but yet not so as to be accounted really Wise, Good, Righteous, by it. *Christ* himself is said in Scripture to be *Ours*, or *given* us (when we have not so much said of His *Righteousness*.) But how is He *Ours*, or *given* us! *Christ* is a Person in Heaven, and He is *Ours* only as we have our part in Him by partaking of His Benefits, and *Himself* in re-
lation

lation to them; so have we his *Righteousness* in partaking of its *Effects*, which relate to it. Believers by virtue of this Union with the *Son* are one also with the *Father*. I Pray, says Christ, *That they may be One, as thou Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they may be one in us, one even, as we are one.* Now, there is none I hope will say, from hence that God's Holiness, His Essential Holiness, is theirs, or His Holy Actions, because they are *one with Him*: No more can they say Christ's *Actions*, or His *Obedience* in his Life and Death (which is His *Righteousness*) is their Obedience, because they are *one with Him*; they must find another Account for it, if they say so. To come then home to the Dr, I must ask these Men, why they will have Christ's *Righteousness* theirs, for their *Justification*, and not theirs, for their *Sanctification*? and I suppose they must say, *Justification* is a Grace that is *Relative*, which makes a *Change* only in our *Relation* towards God, when before we were in a state of Wrath, and now in a state of Favour with Him, which is wrought, or made alone by *Imputation*: but *Sanctification* is a Grace that is *Real*, which makes a *Change* of our *Nature*, turning us into *new Creatures* from Sin unto God, and is wrought on the Soul by the *Operation of God's Spirit*, and not by *Imputation*. Hence it appears, that seeing this Union is the Ground for that which makes a *Real change*, not made by *Imputation*, it cannot be the Ground for that which makes a *Relative change by Imputation only*. The great, if not only thing we have by this mystical Union between Christ and the Believer, is the *Spirit*, flowing from the *Head* to the *Members*; and the *Spirit* is given for its *proper Work*, which is to quicken, regenerate, sanctify; the fruits whereof, are Faith, Repentance, Holy living, Peace, Love, Joy, and not *Imputation*.

Let us then come now to the other Account or Ground, upon which Imputation is built, which is Christ's *Mediation for us*; and this is that Ground which is commonly apprehended, and is so, and hath been hitherto so supposed by us, as appears by what hath been said; the Dr, and his Bre-

then accounting, that in the work of *Mediation*, Christ acted as a publick Person, and Representative of the *Elect*; but I apprehend his *Mediation* to concern all *Mankind*, He being the *Lamb of God*, who by the Sacrifice of Himself, hath taken away the Sins of the World. The Scripture, and what will be said, is full on our side; and hence therefore, there is this one thing to be taken into consideration only; to wit, wherein the Dr, and I agree, and wherein we differ. We both agree as to Christ's *Mediation*; that the Work of it was to reconcile God and Man, and that what he did in order to it, was done and suffered in our stead: But then we differ in understanding this Point of, in our stead. We must distinguish therefore, and know that Christ's doing and suffering in our stead, may have a double Construction. The one is *so in our stead*, as that we are freed from that suffering and doing, our selves (understanding such doing as he did; to wit, so, as perfect Obedience was the condition of Life, for we are freed from Obedience no otherwise) yet enjoy the Benefits; and the obeying and suffering of Christ in our stead, and the imputation thereof in this sense, which is but an Imputation *quoad fructus*, I maintain: The other is *so in our stead*, as that we are Legally reputed to do and suffer what Christ did, and suffered as our *Legal Person*, that is as our *Attourney* or proper Representer in Law, which makes the Imputation thereof to be an *Imputation in Se*; and this Doctrine we oppose, being that which consequently does draw, and hath drawn so many, into *Antinomianism*, though not formerly seen by the Orthodox. To this purpose it is fit that we thoroughly understand this *Mediatory* Work of Christ, and especially in regard to the end of it.

Sect. V.

IN the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, Christ is said in one place, to be the *Mediator*, in another, the *Surety* of

of a better Covenant, they both intend the same thing; and for the understanding or explaining thereof, there are some that say, He was a Surety in behalf of *God*, and some in behalf of *Man*; but I apprehend neither. God needs no Surety for performance of his part, his Word is enough: and if Christ undertook for our Performance, then should we all perform, and be Sav'd; for the Suretiship, or Mediatorship of Christ was for all Mankind, He being the Mediator between God and *Man*, not between God and the *Elect* only. That which I apprehend therefore, is plainly nothing else, but that *Christ* was a Mediator as *Moses* was a Mediator; to wit, in order to the making this *better Covenant* for us, as he acted in order to the making that *Political* Covenant which was made between God and that *People*. Upon this account, there was something for Christ to do for reconciling God to us, which did lie upon him on his part, as Mediatory towards procuring God's Condescension to this Covenant; and therefore, I will understand with the Dr, that his *Suretiship* did lye in taking our *Debt* upon Him to pay it. This Debt to the Law we owed, was double; that of *Obedience* to the *Precept*, and that of suffering the *Penalty* for our transgressing it. As to both these, what Christ did and suffer'd, was *in our stead*. This the Dr, and I, agree upon. Now, to do or suffer any thing in anothers stead (which hath in effect been intimated) is to do and suffer that which the other ought, to the end, that the other may nor do or suffer it, but escape. When Jesus Christ theretore did fulfil the Law, both as to the *Precept* and *Sanction*, that the Law might not be exactly executed *by*, or *upon* us; to affirm that what He did do, and suffer, was, that God might look on us to have done, and suffered in Him, is a flat Contradiction. An *Imputation* then *in Se*, I discard, and persue my Point. Mr. *Baxter* I know, and Mr. *Williams* do say, Christ did suffer, that we might not suffer, but he did not obey, that we might not obey.

This Dr. in this particular, hath considered the matter deeper. If Christ did not obey that we might not obey, then he obeyed not in our stead, which *in our stead* does signifie: But he did obey and suffer both in our stead. He paid both Debts of ours mentioned in our stead, and both go into *Satisfaction*. The Obedience he performed, was a perfect Obedience, and the Law requiring such as is perfect, or else that it cannot be accepted, we know, that through Christ we are freed from that Exaction. To this purpose the Dr. hath spoken right, and we know also it is the common Determination of our Divines on the point of our freedom from the Law. We are not freed from it in respect of our *Obedience*, but we are freed from it in these two respects (to name no other) *Quoad Justificationem, & quoad Rigorem*. Though we are Sinners, we are not Condemned; and though our inchoate Obedience is imperfect, it is through Christ accepted and rewarded. It is plain then, that seeing God does not deal with us according to the *Law of Works*, there must be another Law, a *Law of Grace* according to which he does deal with us; that is, the *better Law or Covenant* which our Mediator hath by his Blood procured for us: And when we have another Law or Covenant, than that of Works to be judged by, this zealous Dr. may chafe if he will, but he sees that his Cause must be lost. The *Law of Works* (or *Law of Nature*) Mr. *Humfrey* has it over and over in his Books, is indeed, and must for ever continue to be the *Rule of Living*, but it is the Law of Grace, or the Gospel is, and shall be the *rule of Judgment*.

The Dr. speaks of that Man, of Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Clark*, as if they were *Papists*: but, where is the *Papist* that states the Matter as they do? If there be any do, they are in the right, and the Dr. may call them *Protestants*, as us *Papists*. The *Papist* and *Protestant*, I think, generally in their Dispute about Justification, do apprehend the *Law of Works* to be the *rule of Judgment*; and supposing this were so, there is no
 flesh

flesh can answer this Doctor's Book, it were irrefragable. There could be no justification but by an *Imputation in Se*, if it were so: But when it is by the Law of Grace (*According to my Gospel, says Paul*) that we are to be *Judged*; it is not Christ's Righteousness (which is a Conformity to the Law of Works) that we need here to be *imputed in Se*; for it suffices, that his Righteousness is the Meritorious Cause, and imputed *quoad Effectus*, this being *one Effect*, that our Faith alone, or Evangelick Condition perform'd, is accepted unto Pardon and Salvation through him.

Now, that it is by a Law of *Grace*, or the *Gospel*, and not that of *Works*, that we shall be Judged, the Words of our Lord's own Mouth, when he is speaking of the great Day, and the process of that Judgment, is to me most convincing. *Come ye Blessed, for when I was hungry, ye fed Me. And the Righteous to Life everlasting.* If I ask this Dr. now, who are the Righteous here, and what this Righteousness? I cannot think he hath the Face and Conscience, to say, Christ means *Righteous in his Righteousness*, but Righteous in *doing Righteousness*; for Christ tells us, they are such as *Feed the Hungry*, and have shewn their Faith by their Charity; and when such are the Righteous here, they must be so according to a *Law of Grace*; there being none Righteous according to the *Law of Works*; and therefore, it is not by the Law of *Works* but of *Grace*, that we shall be Judged.

As for the Doctors seince Denyal of any such Law, which his lost Cause, if that be made good, does prompt him to; If Mr. *Williams* in his Answer to him, hath not said enough to satisfy him, or abate his Confidence, there is a Defence, writ by a sedulous and gracious Spirited Servant of God, a *Presbyterian*, to maintain the Gospel to be a Law against a Learned Independent Brother, which he cannot be ignorant of; and I desire him to read it candidly, and without prejudice, if he can; and if he cannot, I desire others that can; and I suppose they may receive some very soft and found information,

formation, and make good improvement of that edifying Book; I mean it, as to the general concernment thereof.

The Question then after this, between this Dr. and us, is not really any such thing, as he would have, to make us *Papists*; but that which indeed must make such as follow him *Antinomians*, being this, whether in the Sinners Justification Christ's Righteousness is imputed *in se*, without Faith as the Evangelick Condition (for these Men will have Justification to be so *gratis*, as to be without Condition): or whether, we are justified by Faith as the Evangelick Condition performed through the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us in its Effects? This is one Effect now, (we say) thereof; that Faith is accepted of God for Righteousness; and these are others, our Pardon and Salvation, that follow upon it.

SECT. VI.

AS for the Doctor's Book, I have read it all over, but I set not my self to examin particulars, it is too much of it. If I could, or should answer it in the *Push-Pin* work of *Pro* and *Con*, there is no body would print it, or perhaps read it. Nevertheless, I will say freely, that upon my reading the Book, it did exceed my expectation, and that both as to the *Learning* and *Sagacity* of the Author. I can easily perceive how another excells me in one regard or another in every thing; and being one that take up none of these controverted Points, but with some thoughts, that there is Reason also on the other side, and that I am subject to Error, being short in my Ability of some of them that oppose; I do apprehend that such Books that are writ against a Man, are to be taken in better part, than to be flatter'd by such as are writ for him; because they may become but providential Mercies, if they prevent any hurt which may be done by him where he errs, as we do all in something or other. And

as for the Abuses that are incidental from such zealous, vehement, hot, acrimonious Writers, they are to be born, as we do Storms and foul Weather; or rather, as we bear the Infirmities of Brethren; that is, pitifully, but without anger or trouble. I will instance in one or two lesser matters, and in regard to his making his Opposers *Papists*, as is said before. In one place, where the Papist is saying, that Christ's Righteousness can never be made to be *formally ours*; that is, so as to be *causa per quam* that we are justified, because that is, *causa Meritoria, propter quam*: Mr. H. says, and I say the same, for the truth is truth. Here says the Dr, Mr. H. confesses himself to be a *Papist*: But the Dr. knows, or others do, that many of our late Divines, more considerate, have receded from the Doctrine which former Protestants defended against the *Papist*, that Christ's Righteousness is the *formal cause* of our Justification; and when he calls Mr. H. *Papist* for this, Mr. H. is not to care, (and he cares not) because he knows, he is none. * Again, when as to the distinction of a *Causa per quam* & *propter quam*, which Mr. H. uses several times; the Dr. quotes *Bel-larmine* using the same, and says, Mr. H. took it from him: But what need the Dr, in saying some thing he knows is true, to mingle

* There are *Letters* between Mr. H. and the Reverend Mr. C. Entituled, *Ultima Manus*, which do purposely vindicate our Doctrine against this Accusation. If any will be but so sedulous as to seek the difference there, and be content with so much as is warrantable, and not require more than the Scripture can allow, they may find satisfaction. There is moreover, a Book come out newly, (this very Term) Entituled, *The true Notion of imputed Righteousness*, and our Justification thereby, which in the Epistle to the Reader, declares this Accusation a Slander, and after the proof, hath these Words. *We say* (says that Author, who appears to have taken up this Doctrine out of Piety, as well as out of a sound Judgment, and good Conscience, which is to me remarkable) *that although the Lord Jesus hath satisfied offended Justice, and merited all saving Priviledges; yet we can never have peace with God, nor right to Christ, or his purchased Benefits, nor be accepted of God through Christ, until we be qualified with that Grace the Gospel requires.* If any *Papist* says the same, who can gainsay him? Which Grace (he goes on)

doth not give the right in its own nature (or justifies) as it is inherent, but as God accounts or reckons it to do so; that is, as he imputes it for Righteousness. The Papists place Justification in the Imputation, We, in the Imputation. So he, and you may see the same farther explained in Mr. H's *Right of God*, p. 20. and 24. which yet is but part of what is more full in his *Ult. Man.* now mentioned.

his

his conjecture (and that so peremptorily over and over) which is false and untrue; for Mr. *H.* took not the distinction from *Bellarmino*, nor any other (Understand the applying the same to the Point, as *Bellarmino* and he both do), for else he would not have used it so often as he does, and that, as from himself. Nevertheless, he is beholding to the Dr, to tell him, that *Bellarmino* says the same; for he sees thereby, (*Bellarmino* being as to that, in the right) that what appeared rational to him, arising from his own thoughts; the same does appear so to such as are wiser than he, which makes him to like what he hath said, but the better for it. However, though such Slurs or Contempts as these, which stifle no light, are to be passed; yet when a Man shall offer some scintillations of truth taken up from the Scripture, and not from others; and supposing them momentous, yet see them slighted, or rejected, he cannot be so easy with such prejudice, seeing the Vindication is necessary, and yet not proper for ones self; because, unless others be convinced by them as well as himself, they signify nothing.

For one instance of this kind; when in the Question, how the *Grace* of God can be *free*, yet tendered and obtained but on *condition*, which hath perplexed many Divines, Mr. *H.* Answers, *It is free in regard to the old Terms which God might require, and does not: and also, that the new being so unequal, binders not Grace.* Mid. way of Just. p. 8. This is a thort and true Solution (you may see more words in the Book) but the Dr, is not so Ingenuous to mind the former part of these Words so much as he ought, where the stress is laid by Mr. *H.* and is peculiar, but carps rather at the latter; which he does too, through the prejudice of his Opinion, which makes him that he takes not the *Apostle* right, when he speaks of a Reward of *Grace* and *Debt*. The *Apostle* certainly does understand, that if a Man had *Works* (that is perfect Works) the Reward would be of *Debt*, and that being of *Faith*, it is of *Grace*. There is therefore a Reward of *Debt*,

Debt, and a *Reward of Grace*, in regard to the *Constitution*, *Ordination*, or *Appointments* thereof at first, which the Dr hath not considered; and which is not of *Voluntary Distribution*, or *present Gift*. Namely, when a Person Ordains, or Appoints a Reward proportionable, or unproportionable to the Condition imposed. For example, I promise a Bricklayer for his Days Work half a Crown, or three Shillings, if he works hard: the giving him this, is a Reward of Debt, because it is Justice to promise it him at first, as well as to give it him; by reason his Work deserves it: But, if I promise his Man, to give him half a Crown to go up the Ladder, and tell me what Work is done, or what is behind to do; here is no Consideration proportionable, equal, or valuable why I should promise, or give it; and this *Reward* is to be reckoned therefore of *Grace*: Nevertheless, the Man having done what he was bid, may require the Reward as his due by promise no less than the other; tho' the one in regard to the *Constitution*, *Ordination*, *Appointment*, is a Reward of *Debt*, and the other of *Grace*. I will set this forth yet more Scripturely, from the Parable of the Penny. The *Houfholder* agrees with the *Labourers* in the Morning for a Penny a Day; but to the others he sends into the *Vineyard* after, he says only he will give them what is right. Suppose now, he had said to those he sent in at the Eleventh Hour, seeing you have waited so long to be hired, I will give you as much as if you had gon to work all Day: I grant to the Dr upon this Supposition, that the Penny is due to these by virtue of the Promise, no less than the other; but I say, this makes it not a *Reward of Debt* to them (according to the Account of the *Apostle*) as it is to the other; because the *Promise* to them in the Morning, is a Promise of *Justice*, an Appointment according to Commutative Justice, there being an equality between the *Work* and the *Wages*, so that the payment of their Penny, is not only by Promise, but in Justice, to be made: But as to the other,

D

the

the *Promise* being altogether of *Grace*, the performance of the *Promise* must accordingly be so reckoned, and the *Penny* as to those, being only because of the *Promise*, is of *Grace*. This now is to be stood upon as consonant wholly to the Mind of the *Apostle*, when he accounts that, *If of Works*, the Reward would be of *Debt*; but *if of Faith*, it must be of *Grace*. That is all one as to say, the *Condition* of the Law of *Works* (*Do this and Live*) made the Reward to be of *Debt*, if it had been perform'd: But the *Condition* of the Law of *Grace*, or the Gospel (*Believe and be Sav'd*) makes it to the Performer, to be only of *Grace*; for, *it is of Faith* (says the *Apostle*) *that it may be of Grace*. Thus much, I say, in regard to the Exceptions the Dr puts in; but the Solution of the Question offer'd by Mr. H, which is not common with others (who in what they say, do not answer (as he shews) the Intendment of the *Apostle*, when he regards that altogether) does lye in what he hath said as to the former part of the Words, for which the Book is to be consulted by those that will receive the Edification. The Question is, how we can be justified *freely, gratis*, or how our Justification and Salvation can be of *Grace* when the Gospel requires *Conditions*? The Answer is, because they are not those *Conditions* which makes the Reward to be of *Debt*. I declare says Mr. H.) that God's abatement of the Terms, and requiring a new Condition, is that which therefore makes it free, seeing it is tendred and obtained without performance of the old. This is steady to the *Apostle*, firm, and should not have been gain said.

I must confess yet in regard to the Dr, that some of our first Reformers have made the main Difference between the Law and Gospel, to be this; that the Law hath, and the Gospel hath not Conditions, which the Dr embraces: But if he will be set right, and consider, I must tell him, that when Christ or His Apostles say, *Repent, and your Sins shall be blotted out; Confess them, and they shall be forgiven*:

R epen-

Repentance is made the Condition of Pardon, as when the Law says, *Do this and Live*, Obedience is made the condition of Life. Pardon indeed belongs to the Gospel, the Law knows none; The Law says, Confess and be Executed; it is the Gospel says, confess and be Absolved. As thus much then is certain to me, and according to the Scripture; so there is this also is most certain to me and the Dr too, that when the Law says *Do this, and Live*, the Gospel says otherwise; and consequently the Gospel is not *Conditional* as the Law is; that is, the Gospel requires not the Condition the Law does, the Gospel requires not *Works*, but *Faith*, as the Condition of Justification and Salvation. This is the truth, and the whole truth most plainly, and there is no more truth in the Point but this, which those Divines have mistaken who thereupon have said, the *Gospel is without Conditions*. In this sense must the Apostle be understood, when he says, *If of Grace, then not of Works; and if of Works, then not of Grace*, as hath been touched, and shall be spoken of more hereafter, as to what the *Works* are that he means. If the Dr is so ingenuous now to receive the Information, and Day-light, let him receive it: If not, I must be sorry for him. To say the Gospel hath no Conditions, is a dangerous Tenent, it is to say Christ Preached it not. *Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*. It is to destroy all Preaching. As for the main body of our Divines therefore they are for Conditions, as appears by Mr. Baxter, who hath quoted a hundred in their own words at large in the *Confession of his Faith*, and seeing the most of them have received the Notion of the imputed Righteousness of Christ in the sense of the Doctor, they say, that when a Man Repents and Believes, God imputes to him Christ's Righteousness (not before), and thereby his Sins are covered, and his Person accepted, and they suppose (as having no thought of other) an *Imputation in se* to be necessary hereunto: But I apprehend not so, for so long as a Man's

Faith and Repentance is accepted through Christ unto Pardon and Life, and an Imputation *quoad Effectus* serves for that, there is no need of more, and there is no more. As for that common saying, that *the Person must be first accepted before his Offering*, which is said of *Abel*, let Men take heed of a misunderstanding, God is no respecter of Persons; if *Cain* had had *Abel's* Faith and honest Heart, he should have been accepted. It was *Abel's* Faith, *Abel's* Sincerity, and it is one Man's Faith (that is a sound Faith) which makes him acceptable, and his Service so, when another is not accepted in what he does, because it is not done from that principle. There is no need of Christ's Righteousness *in its self*, which none have formally but himself, to make the Person accepted with it, so long as his Faith is accepted for that, or for his Merits sake, and he accepted upon his Faith. I know that if a Minister Preaches against an *Imputation in se*, the People may mistake him as Preaching against the *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness* altogether: But I hope he may Preach for it, and as zealously as he will, but yet understand himself the true import thereof, and take his season to inform them as much, least they be lead into *Antinomianism* by it.

SECT. VII.

IF this Doctor's Book (to speak farther of it) had been writ with another temper, and the Author unknown, I think it done so thoroughly on one side (for it is partial all over) that it might put the matter to a stand (I mean with some) whether we should follow Mr. *Baxter*, or this Author. I speak thus openly to shew my own Genius (I think) rather than any thing else; for I must acknowledg, that I may be mistaken as to the Desert of the Person, and his Book, seeing I gave it but a present Reading, and purposely declined my concernment with it. But this is apparent, the Doctrine he stands upon, is what he believes to be according

cording to our first *Reformers*, and he shews accordingly a Zeal for it, which is to be piously construed upon that account; though the doubt at bottom truly be, whether our *Reformers*, or Followers of them, did not go too far in their Explanation of this Article, to find out an Imputation of Christ's Righteousness *in Se*, to be necessary when an Imputation of it *quoad Effectus* is enough, and all there can be possible in it.

Nay, and what if the Dr. in his *Imputation in se*, be out, and our first *Reformers* (however their next Followers came to it) did go no farther than we? I will transcribe a Paper therefore, I had lately sent me from an inquisitive Learned Friend, though it be long, in his own Words. *In the the Life of Zwinglius, written by Melchior Adam, we have the several Articles of Religion agreed upon by the first Reformers, in the Conference at Marpurg in the Year 1529. Of which Articles the Sixt and Seventh are as followeth.* "Sexto, quod fides sit donum Dei ejusmodi quod nullo præcedente opere ac merito nostro obtinere neq; ex propriis viribus consequi possumus: Sed spiritus sanctus dat & efficit fidem pro ut vult in cordibus nostris quando Evangelium sive verbum Christi audimus. Septimo, quod hæc fides sit justitia nostra coram Deo utpote per quam Deus nos justificat imputata nobis justitia sine ullo opere aut Merito nostro, atq; ita a peccato morte & inferno nos liberat, sibiq; conciliat adeoq; saluat nos propter filium suum in quem credimus, cujus justitia, vita & omnibus beneficiis donamur & fruimur. Hac de causa igitur sentimus omnia vota, totum ordinem monasticum quatenus ad salutem necessarius putatur, jure & merito damnari. *These two Articles with all the rest, were Subscribed by Martinus Lutherus, Phillip Melancthon, Justus Jonas, Andrias Osiander, Johannes Brennius, Stephanus Agricola, Johannes Oesolampadius, Huldricus Zwinglius, Martinus Bucerus, Jaspar Hadio. All these Reformers agreed, and gave it under their Hands, that the ve-*

ry

ry Faith which is the Effect of the Holy Spirit in our Hearts, is our Righteousness before God; so all the Righteousness by which we are justified, Christ's being imputed as the Meritorious Cause of our Justification, without any Work or Merit of our own. This is the plain obvious sense of their Words, and they are capable of no other sense without offering violence to them. Thus he, I will add only, if Faith (as they say) be our Righteousness before God, by which we are justified, then must Christ's Righteousness be imputed *quoad Effectus* only (not *in se*) in the Sinner's Justification. I must add moreover, he that says Christ's Righteousness is the Formal Cause of our Justification, must say, it is imputed *in se*, as this Dr does: He that says it is the Meritorious Cause, not the Formal, does say, it is imputed *quoad Effectus* only, which is the Truth (I believe) and not to be concealed.

As for the Notion of an *Imputation in se*, it was variously anvil'd, and beaten out at first by our Reformers; and as for what Luther at first conceiv'd, it was so hard to be receiv'd, or Preach'd aright, that it made his own heart misgive him, that after his Death it would not be maintain'd: Nor are we to believe, that it continued his Life time altogether as he had hammer'd it in his first thoughts. It was by degrees that it was raised to that pass as the Dr maintains it; and being in the late Times found dangerous in regard to *Antinomianism*, the Cause hath been thoroughly disputed by Mr. Baxter, so as his Opposers (even to the chiefest of such Divines) being overcome, the Doctrine of Justification now is rendred more intelligible, more clear, and safely preachable, that it is not like to be forsaken, as Luther feared his first Conceptions might be.

I doubt not but *Abel*, and *Seth*, and *Enoch*, and *Noah*, and all since, were Justified and Saved upon the Account of Christ's Righteousness imputed to them *quoad Effectus*, tho' they understood not so much; but that Christ's Righteousness *in se* should be made theirs by Faith instrumentally

Receiving

Receiving it, and they become Righteous thereby in his Righteousness, and so justified formally by it, I do not see how it could be, without their understanding of it, or how they could understand it. It may be this Author is able to believe, that they all had understanding thereof, seeing he does believe so of *Abraham*; of whom when it is said, *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness*, this Dr says, that this [*It*] is Christ's Righteousness; *He believed, and Christ's Righteousness was imputed to him for Righteousness*, which is a strain, above *Abraham's* Knowledge (as is past doubt with me) and such as others cannot serue up their Belief unto, especially seeing that though it is most certain it was his *Faith* that was accounted for *Righteousness*, yet was the Satisfaction and Merits of Christ imputed to him *quoad fructus aut Effectus*, as well as to us now that believe since He is revealed in the Gospel.

As for any other *Imputation*, our Learned Dr *Field* in his *Appendix* to the Third Book of the *Church*, lets us know there is none, seeing he shews that it is *quoad Effectus*, that God gives us Christ's Merits or Righteousness, and not the thing it self, which is impossible. This Mr. *Baxter* quotes in his *Confession of Faith*, p. 394. and says, p. 265. *I doubt not to prove that Christ never communicates his Merit in its formal nature to any Man, but only the Effects of it. He gives us his Merit as a Man gives a Prisoner such a Sum, which indeed, he never shewed him in it self, or gave him, but only to the Person that hath took him for his Ransom.* I remember also *Forbesius*, in his exquisite Book, *Modesta quæstiones* from whence I think I took my first notice, is exprels of this Judgment; so that this *Imputation in se*, which is the Doctrine the Dr takes up he supposes from our Reformers, I do believe was never stood in the World before Christ, nor in the Church before *Luther*; for tho' there be occasional sayings in some Fathers that may be so interpreted since; yet was it not at any time the set Doctrine the Church maintained; seeing I know that St.

Austin

Austin hath otherwise lead the way to the Papists. And if this be a Doctrine so late *Minted*, we have no need of such Superstition, as to lay that stress upon it as Mr. *Richardson*, the Dr mentions, and other Learned Pious and Zealous Men like him have done. The Christian Religion and our Salvation is not to be Pinned on what is affirmed in this Dr's Book. The Holy Scripture commands to Believe, and Repent; and tells us, if we Believe, we shall be Saved; if we Repent, we shall be Forgiven; it never says, if we Repent, if we Believe, we shall have Christ's Righteousness imputed to us; and yet if we Repent and Believe the Righteousness of Christ is imputed *quoad Effectus*, in that we are Pardoned, and Saved.

Here by the way, may a Question be askt among Friends: *What then is Man's justifying Righteousness?* One Friend says, Faith is our justifying Righteousness: Another says, Faith is not our justifying Righteousness; and both being Friends, they will say *Faith is our Gospel-righteousness, and that we are justified by Faith.* I will Answer therefore, that neither of the two are in the right, and yet both in the right. For without Christ's Righteousness, Faith is not justifying; and with it, it is justifying. *Though there be two Righteousnesses apart*, (says Mr. H.) *they make together but one justifying Righteousness; that is, these two Righteousnesses are two parts of one whole justifying Righteousness:* (To wit, they concur as two Causes, the Meritorious, which is an Efficient, and the Formal, which is a Constituent, of this joint Effect) *according to one Sentence, and one Justification.* Animadversions on Mr. *Williams's* last Books, p. 30. and 31.

There is indeed one Question seriously put by this Dr, Whether the *Neonomian* in his Dying hour, dare venture his eternal State upon the bottom he hath laid? Unto which I Answer, that I humbly doubt not of God's goodness, but that if there be such a thing as an *Imputation in se*; if I be found a sincere penitent Believer (which I pray God I may) He will
 impure

impute to me Christ's Righteousness that believe not such a thing, as well as to him that does believe it, seeing an Imputation *quoad fructus* does give as much Glory to God, and Honour to Christ, and lets occasion of *Boasting* than an Imputation *in se*: And then I Answer farther, that if the *Neonomian* might choole the bottom upon which depends his eternal State, he would choose the *Antinomian's* bottom, which is Christ's Righteousness alone without any thing done, or to be done on our part: But seeing we must stand or fall on that bottom God hath Appointed, I do advise the Dr, and every *Antinomian*, that they take heed to themselves that they be found true penitent Believers (which they may be without the Works of the Law, or those Works the Law requires unto justification, but not without sincerity of heart and life) or else they must be sure, if the Scripture be true, that they shall have no Righteousness of Christ imputed to them, neither *in se*, nor in the *Effects*.

Sect. VIII.

And now having before, freely and largely together with other matters, shewn what Imputation of Christ's Righteousness I disprove, that is, an Imputation *in se* as built upon either ground there mentioned; I think fit here to shew what imputation thereof I do hold, which is such perhaps, as comes nearer to our first Reformers than that which is since current, and the Dr follows. I do hold with our Reformers, and all Orthodox Divines generally, that Christ's Righteousness is the *Meritorious Cause* of our Justification; I would not be guilty of denying this for my life. I do hold yet, that his Righteousness is *imputed* to us as the Meritorious Cause of our Justification, according to our first Reformers as he judges, that hath before cited their *Conference at Marpurk*. I do hold then, that his Righteousness is ours, and reputed ours in the Causality of it as it produces such

E

Effects

Effects, but *Relatively* only, not *in se* (which as two I oppose to one another) that is, in relation to those Effects: And so I say, the Effects becoming really ours upon believing, Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us in the Effects. Justification is, I count, God's Imputation according to his Law of Grace, of our Faith for Righteousness; which Righteousness includes in it both a Conformity to the Gospel, and a Right to Pardon and Life. These Effects now of Christ's Merits, which are God's accounting us Righteous, together with Pardon and Life becoming in our Justification really ours; his Righteousness (I repeat) is imputed, or is ours, in relation to those Effects, and so only. I may deliver my self more easily in in Mr. Baxter's own Words, which are these; *Justitiam Christi nobis ita imputatam dici posse ut Causa Meritoria nostra remissionis, justificationis, adoptionis, non fide sed vere estimaretur, & ita nobis imputatur (datur, adjudicatur) non simpliciter & in se, sed in Effectis.* This he sets down most solemnly as the Judgment he stands by, which any one may see in the place, *Meth. Theol. Part 3. p. 54.* He adds, his Explication by his usual simile of the Price that redeems the Captive which he never has, but yet is his, in his liberty. He after concludes, *Hec simplex, plana, facilis, antiqua veritas a recentioribus subtilitatibus obscurata in lucem iterum vindicanda est.* Let the Dr therefore keep his Accusations of Novelty to himself, and see if the common Protestant be not rather guilty of it than we.

I will explain our Tenent yet more clear according to my Understanding. The Righteousness of Christ may be considered *Absolutely*, or *Simply*, without respect to such Effects as the Cause of them, and so it is not imputed to us, or is ours, by no means, for then it should be ours *in se*, or imputed *in se*, and be *Formalis nostra justitia*, which we deny, and that upon plain Reason, because, that which is the *Meritorious Cause*, cannot be the *Formal*, and the same thing both Cause and Effect of it self: But Christ's Righteousness may

may be considered *Relatively*, as the Meritorious Cause of such Effects, and that it is imputed (we maintain as well as others) and is ours in regard to these *Effects*, tho' *in se* it be not, seeing those Effects *ex se* & *in se* do so *dicere respectum* & *habitudinem ad Causam suam*, that is, have that respect to the Meritorious cause of them, as they are not to be conceived without it, or to be ours, but by virtue of it.

The Righteousness of Christ is not our *Material* or *Formal* Righteousness, and therefore not ours *in se*; but it is ours in its causality (as I have said) as related to the Effects which are ours, and no otherwise. As our Sins are Christ's in the Causation of His Sufferings, but not His therefore *in se*, for then he must be a *Sinner by Imputation*, which we deny: So Christ's Righteousness is ours in the causality of its Effects, but not ours *in se*, for then should we be as *Righteous as He by Imputation*, which we deny also.

To be yet more full, or speak more out, I believe that Christ's Righteousness, that is, His *Obedience* in his Life and Death to His *Father's Commandment*, or *Mediatorial Law*, in order to the procuring the Covenant of Man's Salvation, or the Benefits we have by him, and by it, was imputed by God to all Mankind, as the Meritorious cause of those Benefits in the *Impetration* thereof; so that God did verily account and accept of what Christ did and suffered in Man's behalf, or in our stead, whereby his Justice was satisfied, the Covenant made, and the Benefits to be enjoyed upon the terms by all the World: But yet is there no *Imputation in se*, even in the *Impetration* thereof, (which sometimes I thought) because it is imputed only to this effect, that all may be Saved upon condition, the Covenants condition: And as for the *Application*, it is imputed likewise to us, or is ours, and can be only, in the Effects. That is, it is not ours *in se*, ours really, or ours absolutely, (which I count all one) but *Relatively*; that is, the Effects or Benefits which are indeed

ours do relate to that as their Meritorious cause, and so it is ours only in that relation it has to those Effects, as hath been spoken.

And here now does appear a Reconciliation to be made between Mr. *H.* and Mr. *Williams.* Let Mr. *W.* give up his new Notions; The one he has about *Christ's Right to his Reward,* being *in se* ours, when the Question is, whether his *Obedience* (procuring that right) be *in se* ours; and another is of his *Obedience* being imputed for our *pleadable Security*, when the Question is, Whether it be imputed for our *Righteousness*; which Notions, both being but ingenious mistakes of *one thing for another*, let us suppose them retracted (seeing Mr. *H's* Book is not answered) and Mr. *W.* to stick here, that upon Mr. *H's* saying from Mr. *Baxter*, that the Effects being really ours, the Righteousness of Christ is *Relatively* ours in these Effects; he assents on this, and says, that *when that Righteousness it self is imputed relatively to the special Effects, it is truly an Imputation in se*; and by this, some do account he hath got his Point. Here then in the main, is an Accord between them, and there is only a Logomachy continues; to wit, whether this *Imputation quoad Effectus*, wherein they agree in the oppugning that *Imputation in se* that is held by the Dr, may yet be called an *Imputation in Se* upon another construction. Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Williams*, I suppose agree in this, that Christ's Righteousness is imputed as the Meritorious Cause of our Justification, and Mr. *H.* denies it not. They all three agree in the main Point for which our first Reformers have been quoted. They all three agree likewise in the Denyal of an *Imputation in se* in the sense of the common Protestant, that understand it so, as that God accounts us to have fulfilled all Righteousness in Christ, and so His Righteousness to be our *formal* Righteousness that justifies us. Here then, when they agree in what they oppose, and what they hold, there is a perfect Agreement *de Re*, and the Question is only *de Nomine*, whether

whether this Imputation they agree in, an Imputation *quoad Effectus*, or of Christ's Righteousness as the Meritorious cause of these Effects, is truly, and may be reckoned, taken, spoken of, as an Imputation *in se* according to Mr. Williams.

That which may be urged for him, is, An Imputation is granted by Mr. H. There must be then an Object of this Imputation, something there must be that is imputed: If this be not Christ's Righteousness *it self*, it is nothing: If it be *its self*, then *in its self*. For Answer to this, I must confess here is a nice Distinction, between *its self*, and *in its self*; between an *Ipsa Christi justitia imputatur*, and a *Justitia Christi in se non imputatur*; yet seeing it is made, and the same person hath affirmed the one, and denies the other, it must be observed. Mr. Baxter (it hath been friendly objected to me) does, in a Book I have read, but have not by me, (answering to the Question, whether Christ's Righteousness is imputed to us, and granting it to be so, as the Meritorious cause of such and such Benefits) say, *they are ours*; and *To say the Benefits are ours* (saith he) *importeth that the causal Righteousness of Christ is related to us, and to the Effects as such a cause, and so it is it self ours in that sense that it is so related*. In which passage there is nothing intended but that *Imputation quoad Effectus* which we hold, only the words [*it self*] is to be noted as used by him, at least once, if not other where, and it does suit with that passage so much exagitated of Mr. Williams, viz. *Besides the Effects, the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed to the Believer*; unto which, if he had at first added *in ordine ad Effectus*, it had been happy; but it suffices he declares that for his sense at last. Now when Mr. Baxter says, *it self*, and Mr. Williams, the *very Righteousness* of Christ is imputed; another may say the same, that *it is imputed it self, its very self, as it bears a causal relation to the Effects*. But yet seeing Mr. Baxter for all this, does in all his Books still deny that we are *Proprietaries* of Christ's Righteousness, and still does

does say it is not *imputed in se*, but in the *Effects*; here is a distinction made between *its self*, and *in se*, as to his use of the words, so that we must not grant an *Imputation in Se*, unless we will follow Mr. *Williams*, and leave Mr. *Baxter*. The Simile which Mr. *Baxter* still uses to explain his imputation *quoad Effectus* does perfectly confirm me. It is of the *Price* of Redemption already mentioned which the *Captive* hath only in his *Liberty*. If Mr. *Williams* was to frame the Simile, he must have the Money gathered and given to the Slave to redeem himself with it; but to avoid this, Mr. *Baxter* does still suppose the Money given to the Lord of the Slave, so as the *Captive* never sees it, or has it, but enjoys Deliverance by it. It appears then, If Mr. *H.* (who I am willing he should, if he conscionably could) yields to Mr. *Williams*, he must forsake Mr. *Baxter*, which he is not like to do. I answer therefore after this to that which is alledged. *Something there must be that is imputed*, and some may think by this all is wonne: But there is a double something, a *something in Se*, and *something in the Effects*. There is truly *nothing in se* besides *Faith* that is imputed to a Man in his justification, but there is *something in its Effects*; it is Christ's Righteousness is the *something*, and that not Christ's Righteousness *in se* which is imputed but Christ's Righteousness in the *Effects*. When we distinguish of an Imputation *in se*, and *quoad Effectus*, *Quoad Effectus* and *in se* are *membra dividenda*; and if it be imputed then *quoad Effectus*, it cannot be *in Se* also, by the rules of Logick. The form (which is the Essence of a thing) of Justification, lyes in God's Imputation: We are sure he imputes our Faith *in se* to us for Righteousness in our Justification, and how can he impute Christ's Righteousness *in se* to us also? *Omne ens is unum*, can there be two Imputations, and that *in se*, in one Act? Two imputations *in Se* make two Forms, which of one thing cannot be allowed by our Metaphysicks. The Righteousness of Christ is the Meritorious cause of Pardon and Salvation,
and

and may be said to be ours in relation to them upon our Believing, but not ours *in se* also upon that account, for then were we *Proprietaries* of that which does merit them, and thereby made *Meriters*, and *Causers* of our own Salvation. An imputation *in se* according to the sense commonly received, and so the sense of others, is an Errour in Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *W's*, and Mr. *H's* account: If Mr. *H* then does grant that our Imputation *quoad Effectus* is, and may be called an Imputation *in se*; he does lay a stumbling-block before *such others*. If he denies an Imputation *in se*, he offends some, that is, displeases or angers them which is their own fault: But if he grants an Imputation *in se*, he offends in another manner, he gives *occasion* to such others unto *falling*, or to err, or continue in their Errour, which is a real Scandal. *Scandalum est dictum vel factum minus rectum praebens alteri occasionem ruinae*. Therefore Mr. *H* cannot yield to Mr. *W*. in this Point, as he says in his *Animadversions*.

SECT. IX.

AS for the Language the Dr uses, and liberty he takes (something mentioned before) in the undervaluing those he opposes, and what they Write, and wronging them sometimes as it falls out, and more especially in the acrimony of his Spirit, which he lets loose upon presumption of his maintaining the Protestant Cause, and then his extream confidence and partiality (which argues not Strength, but Heat) I cannot commend my Brother, nor yet excuse him altogether upon the account of Zeal, which is so *unbridled* and *bitter* as his. I will give one instance hereof (for it will afford farther matter to be spoken of) which I cannot pass, without a cordial honest reproof. It is in *pag. 91.* where Mr. *Clark* saying, that upon examination of the Scripture, he finds not that *Gospel-works*, and *Gospel-justifying Faith*, are opposed one to another; this Dr tells him, *that his search-*
ing

ing the Scripture, and his not finding so plain truth; argues but judicial blindness, whereby God hath hardned his Heart, and blinded his Eyes. I would not have said this of that Learned, Industrious, Humbly Grave, worthy Person, and good Man, for a Hundred and a Hundred Pound; and I believe he would not for Money, but out of Zeal to his Cause he hath said it; and I remember the Words of our Lord to James and John, *Ye know not what Spirit ye are of.* I leave him to reflect on his words, and consider a Question here that does arise upon this; What the Works are which are excluded by Paul from Justification, for this is a Point of moment? We must not understand by the Works of the Law, that Paul excludes (In stead of the Words, *excluded and excludes*, I should say, *opposed and oppose*, for that Expression of our Divines, is prejudicial to the right sense we seek) to be only the Works of the Ceremonial Law which is abolished, for the Law the Apostle means, is that *by which is the knowledg of Sin*; and that is the moral Law: Nor when we understand that, are we to distinguish between *opera Naturæ*, which are done by our own Strength; and *opera Gratiæ*, done by the Assistance of God's Spirit, and then say (tho' it be after *Austine*) the one is excluded, and not the other; for the Apostle instances in *Abraham*, and excludes his Works, as others. By the Works of the Law then excluded, I declare that the Apostle means those Works which the Law requires unto Justification by it, so that if we do them, they would justify us; and the Apostle excludes works altogether, and only in this sense, because there is none has them to be justified by them, tho' some falsely thought they had them, or what was equivalent to them. *Not by Works of Righteousness we have done.* Mark the Word *done*, for that is (I say) because there are none hath done them, none have the *Righteousness of the Law*, and if justified at all, it must be *without them*. This is the Apostle's true meaning, and nothing else; and yet Dr Owen that excellent Person, in his Book of Justification, and this

Dr a sagacious Person in this Book (which I think, no less *convincing* (if either were) though not so *acceptable* as his) have not so much as the scent of it; and when two such Men are both quite wide from the Apostle's intendment, what will these Mens Books do? That *Faith* and *Grace* are opposed to *Works*, it is beyond Question. *It is of Faith, that it may be of Grace.* That the *Works* the Apostle means, he calls *the Works of the Law*, is also undeniable; but what we are to understand by the *Works of the Law*, is under consideration. There is one Text which the Apostle hath, may confirm us. *The Law* (says he) *is not of Faith*; and What is that? Why it is this; Faith performs not the Law, Believing alone is short of the performance of it, the Law requiring *all things* to be done to *Live* thereby; so that if we be justified by Faith, we are justified without performing the Law; and the performing the whole Law, is the *Works of the Law*, *without which*, the Apostle says, we are justified. This is the certain meaning. And it is in this meaning, that *Grace* and *Works* are inconsistent. *If of Works*, that is such Works, *then not of Grace*; because, such Works would justify, and make the Reward, *of debt* (so the Apostle reckons, if any cavil): And *if of Grace, then not of Works*, that is, I say such Works, perfect Works, full performance, seeing the godly Man's Faith, and inchoate Obedience which is imperfect, are through Christ accepted, and that *of Grace* beyond question. It must be the perfect performance of the Law, I say therefore, that the Apostle means when he says *without Works*; and this appears irrefragably by his instance in *Abraham*. *Abraham* was a Man that not only *Believed* God, but *Obedied* God in a singular manner, and yet he was justified by *Faith without Works*; and how could it be *without Works*, if this was not the meaning; to wit, without *the Works of the Law*, in the full and perfect performance of it? Thus *St. James*, and *St. Paul* are clearly reconciled; *St. James* says, *Abraham* was justified by Offering his Son, *by Faith and*

Works also; and yet *St. Paul* says *without Works*; and what is that, but that *Abraham* had *Works*, and excellent *Works*, yet not perfect *Works*, he was without that perfect performance which the Law requires to Justification by it. And here, if the Dr will call to mind that Question canvased before, how Justification is free, and Salvation of Grace, yet Gospel-works and Gospel-conditions are required, and put the *Solution* thereof offered by Mr. *H.* according to the very Mind of the *Apostle*, together with this *Construction* of his [*without works*] offered by me here, and consider into what Notion they resolve; I cannot see, but so sagacious a Man must be convinced, and conscientious satisfied. In the mean time, as for the present reconciling *James* and *Paul*, by distinguishing of Justification *before Man*, and *before God*, it hath been so often confuted and worn out, that I see what it is to be captivated by Former Divines, and I deeply resent this Zealous Man's Captivity. When the Apostles both say, that *Abraham* was justified by *Faith*, and differ in the ones saying, *by Faith and Works* also, and the other *by Faith without Works*, it is apparently irrational to go to reconcile them by distinguishing either of *Faith* or *Justification*, when the distinction to reconcile them is made by themselves, and that is by distinguishing of *Works*. *James* says, we are justified *by Faith and Works*; that is, by a *Faith working by Love*, which *Paul* owns. *Paul* says, *without Works*, in regard to the full performance the Law requires of us. This is the true Explication, in so much as the same *Apostle* himself in one verse tells us, *Not of works*, and yet in the next he says, *we are Created in Christ Jesus to good Works*, Eph. 2, 9, 10. The interpretation is given, let another that can, express it fuller, and in better Words than I. Now to come more home to the Dr, when the *Apostle* says, we are justified by *Faith without works*, meaning without the full and perfect performance of the Law, and this bold Man with some of our Reformers have taken upon them to preach up Justification by

by Faith *without any works at all* (when if there be not such a Faith as *works by Love*, which is *St. James's Faith and Works also*, the Soul is lost) what shall we think (or himself judge upon second thoughts) of such Preaching? What a Sluce is here opened not only to *Antinomianism*, but to *Libertinism*, which is the effect such Doctrine must needs have, and no other upon ungodly Persons. When the Dr therefore hath considered a little better of it, his heart may smite him concerning Mr. Clark.

In the *Augustan Confession* there is this Article, *Justificamur sola fide propter Meritum Christi sine Meritis operum*, which I cite from a Learned *Lutheran* that hath abbreviated that History, and I observe it for the expression, *sine Meritis operum*. This Dr would say *Sine operibus* (as others before him) without any works whatsoever: But seeing Faith it self is a *Work* (as I must inculcate) and unless that Faith be such as does *work by Love*, it is no sound Faith, and justifies not; I must confess I cannot say so, but *sine Meritis operum*: That is to say, not without *all Works* (not without those works that are the product of Faith, and true Faith cannot be without), but without *Meritorious Works*; that is, without such works as if they were performed would *merit* the Reward, or would make the *Reward of Debt*. This is the certain sense (I say) of the *Apostle* in that *Fourth* to the *Romans*, when after he hath told us that *Abraham*, tho' he was so very a Holy Man, was not justified by his Works, but by his Faith, as I have been speaking already, he argues upon it. *Now to him that worketh is the Reward not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt*. The works then that *Abraham* had not to justify him, are such as if he had them, would have made his *Reward of Debt*, and whereof he might have gloried. *But to him that worketh not* (and so to *Abraham* that worked not) that is, worketh not thus, but *Believeth* (but Believed) *on him that justifieth the Ungodly* (that is such an Ungodly one only as *worketh not*, which is I say, thus work-

eth not) *his Faith* is (*Abrahams's* was) accounted for *Righteousness*. Even *as David* (*St. Paul* goes on) describeth the *Blessedness* of the Man unto whom God imputeth *Righteousness* without Works. The *Blessed Man*, *Paul* quotes out of the *Psalms*, must be also a *Righteous Man*; for there is no Man Blessed but the *Righteous*, and yet for all his *Righteousness* (and *Abrahams*) here is a *Righteousness* imputed without Works, which could not be, if these Works were not such as none can perform; that is, *unfinning* Obedience, or *perfect* Works; for the Quotation following for the proof thereof, makes it appear. *Saying, Blessed is the Man whose Sins are forgiven him.* The Man who hath Sin to be forgiven, must be without perfect Works: He must have kept the Law, and never broke it, that hath such. It is strange to me therefore how so many of our formost Protestant Divines should miss so exceedingly of the Apostles Mind, as to go their way, and make *St. Paul* to be a setter forth of a Doctrine directly contrary to *St. James*, and the most of the other Scripture. It was *Luther's* bold conceit of that *Epistle* not to be *Canonical*, made him so daring, and his Example carryed others; so that the Question in the issue may come to this, Whether the Authority of *St. James* his *Epistle*, or of *Luther*, be greatest, which must decide the Controversy.

Sect. X.

FOR this Dr. himself, I look on him as one that (if any of them do) understands his Point, and I am now willing to talk with him about the matter in such a way as may tend to more good than bare *Dispute*. I perceive how he is for free Grace, and for Faith in opposition to Works, so as a Man must be justified *gratis* by Christ's Blood, and then Repentance and a good Life must come after, intending the Doctrine of our first Reformers, who say, or have said, that though good Works are necessary in regard to God's Command, because they please Him, and are profitable to Men,

Men, and are to be done by justified Persons out of gratitude, yet must not they be held to be necessary *in order* to our Justification or Salvation (which they prove to come to one) so that to go about to do any thing for obtaining of Heaven, they counted all one as to *make Christ of none effect, and to fall from Grace*; and this is the very Spirit of the Dr. I must therefore ask here of him, How he will Preach to People? Will he speak after the *Lutherans* whom he follows, and tell them Christ hath Dyed for them, and they must Believe it, and upon their Believing, they shall be Saved? The *Lutherans* do hold the *Redemption* of Christ to be *Universal*, and they distinguish between the *Acquisition* thereof, and the *Application*. The *Acquisition* (they say) is for all Mankind, though the *Application* be to some particular Persons who are Saved. When the Minister in the *Word* speaks to all in general, and then in delivering of the *Sacrament* to each Man in particular, and says, *this is the Body*, and *this is the Blood* of Christ which was *Broken*, which was *shed for thee*; How can he exercise his Ministry in Faith (and without doubt of a lye) unless Christ's Redemption be *Universal*? To say he acts upon a *Judgment of Charity*, when upon this true account he acts on a *Judgment of Certainty* is an unallowable excusive tergiversation. The *Lutherans* complaint therefore against the *Calvinists* in this, is just, which hath made such Men as *Davenant*, and Arch-Bishop *Usher*, as well as Mr. *Baxter*, Write for the Universality thereof, whom the Parochial Ministers are like to follow, so long as their Opinion and Practice accord. Well, the *Lutheran* Doctrine then being so, that the Redemption of Christ, as to the *Impetration*, or *Acquisition* thereof is *Universal*; let us ask and consider what is the *Application*, whereby those particular Persons that do apply it, and they only, are Saved? And here I apprehend that according to our first *Reformers*, it lies altogether in our very believing it. The Gospel is Preached, which declares our Redemption procured by Christ (without any of our doing,

doing, for we are not all our own Redeemers) according as the Apostle tells us, *In whom we have Redemption, even Remission of Sins*: Now there is no Man can believe this, but Redemption being Universal, he must believe *himself* is Redeemed, that *his* Sins are Forgiven, which is but applying the *Acquisition* to himself, *who loved me, and gave himself for me*; in which full perswasion so particularly applyed, does that *Faith* consist which our first Reformers, accounted to be *justifying*, and save us. Against this Doctrine it will be Objected, that if it be so, the Ungodly and the Wicked must be gratified and encouraged in their Sin, seeing it is but believing what that the Gospel says, which is certainly true, that will Save them. In Answer to which, I must distinguish. There is a Believing, which is only in profession and shew, and affects not the Heart, and because the most of our peoples Faith is but such, and such Doctrine as this must be dangerous to them, I dare not my self Preach it: But there is a True Believing, a believing in earnest, a faith unfeigned, when a man is verily, thoroughly, fully perswaded of what he Believes; so as it Affects his Soul, and carries his Heart and Life after it; and we may say happily, there is no man that so believes the Redemption of *Mankind* as to the *Acquisition*, and *himself* to be Redeemed and Pardoned as to the *Application*, but it will turn him from Sin to God, make him love Christ, and in gratitude give himself up to serve him all the days of his Life; so that it is impossible he should be thereby encouraged in Evil, as it is for the Saints in Heaven to enjoy the beatifical Vision, and to fall from their Station. Let this be added, that Faith (such a Faith) is the peculiar Gift of God, not produced out of our own strength, or free will, but effectually wrought by the Spirit of God upon such as he sanctifies withal, so as they shall be assuredly Saved. And what if this Doctrine should be the true Gospel, and that which should be Preached? Surely it would exceedingly fit the Dr, if he could Preach it: But the more is the pity he cannot,

for

for he believes no such Redemption, but for the *Elect* only, and what then can he Preach? He may tell the People that there is Redemption by Christ, that Justification is by Faith and not Works; but how shall they apply it? He cannot say to any one of them that they are redeemed, or bid them believe it, because he knows not that they are *Elect*. There is no Man ever climb'd up to Heaven to look into God's Books, to see whose Name is Written there, so as to know *a priori*, or believe that he is one of the *Elect*, but he must find it out by the fruits of Election; that is, learn it *a posteriori*, and until he sees such a Faith that is sound, and such a Repentance that is unfeigned, and witnessed by a sincere Obedience, he has no firm Ground to believe he is *Elect*, Redeemed, or Justified: And what benefit or comfort then can the Dr have more in his Doctrine of Justification and Salvation to the *Elect* without Condition, than what is open in ours of Pardon and Salvation obtained for all upon condition, seeing whatsoever we make the Condition, must be found in the *Elect* Person before he presume to believe that he is one, who is capable of Justification or Salvation?

Again, To say that we are justified freely by Faith without Works, understanding as this Dr, all Works *Evangelical as Legal*, that is without Repentance, and those Works which are the fruits of Faith, as a Condition thereof, what advantage is it more than to say as we; that *Faith and Repentance* is the Condition, seeing that unless that *Faith without Works* be such yet as is a true Faith, a *living* and not dead Faith, that is a Faith which *works by Love* (which I must still say) and is productive of its Fruits; which is Repentance and sincere Obedience it justifies not. This the Dr and his Friends must say and acknowledg; and does it not then plainly appear to come all to one, as to any solid Comfort that can be fetcht from his Doctrine, more than ours? We say, *until* a Man Believe and Repent (as Mr H somewhere has it) he

he is not justified, and the Dr I suppose will not allow this, because *until* suspends the Benefits, and so denotes a *Condition*: And yet, *unless* a Man Believes and Repent, he is not justifiable; and unless his Faith be such as *works by Love*, and is a *living* Faith, it justifies not, he and his Friends do, and must say and acknowledg, as I intimated but now: And when the matter is brought to an *Until*, and an *Unless*, how little is the difference in *Words*, and in the *Signification* less?

I will talk yet a little farther with the Dr, for it may be profitable. Divines heretofore did place their justifying Faith in a full perswasion that Christ Dyed for them in particular, and that their Sin was forgiven, but here of late they are abated, and choose rather to place it in a fiducial reliance or trust in God's Mercy thro' Christ for Forgiveness. The Dr and those of his way, cannot be perswaded that Christ Dyed for them in particular, and that their Sins are forgiven without presuming they are Elect: But they may trust or rely on Christ for Pardon without that presumption, or without a full perswasion that they are already forgiven. This then being the more soft and modest apprehension, it hath of late prevailed, and I must hereupon offer my Dr this Question. I do verily cast my self on God, or trust to his Mercy, that for the satisfaction of Christ my Saviour, he will pardon my Sins, and for his Merits, he will accept me to Salvation: Now I ask, whether the Dr in his Opinion does think this a justifying Faith; that is, whether he thinks, I may hope, I may expect, I may pray, that God will impute this Faith to me for Righteousness, without any other Works; for if true Repentance and sincere Obedience be imputed with it, I do not doubt it.

I will wait his leisure for an Answer, and in the mean time I will suppose that another may ask me the Question, And how then do you Preach? To which I Answer, I Preach what the Gospel tells me, that Christ hath procured Redemption (and if Redemption, then Remission of Sin, and

if

if Remission, then Justification, and if Justification, then Salvation) for all, so that the *Acquisition* is *Universal*, which is to be held with the *Lutheran*; and as for the *Application*, I say with them also it is by Faith. Only I declare again and again, as I have declared, that that Faith must be such as *works by Love*, according to *Paul*, and a *living Faith* according to *James*, which he calls *Faith and Works* also; to wit, such a Faith as is productive of true Repentance and sincere Obedience; and this being the Condition, when the *Acquisition* is for all, the *Application* of particular Persons which partake thereof, is made by performing the Condition. This is a plain and short Account of the matter. Go Preach the Gospel, says Christ to every Creature. It must therefore belong to all, even the glad rydings of Pardon and Salvation purchased by Christ, must belong to all. If Pardon then and Salvation belong to all, it must be *absolutely*, or *upon terms*. Not *Absolutely*, for then should *all* be *actually* Saved, and if upon terms, then what terms? Christ hath told us, *He that Believes shall be Saved*. And what is that Belief? Why, it is for a Man when the Gospel is Preached to Receive it, and Live according to it. This is Believing so, as to be Saved. *Credere est fidelis esse*, says *Salvian*. Faith is a *Receiving of Christ* (says the Assemblies Catechism) *as he is offer'd in the Gospel*; which otherwise, and by others, is expressed *Receiving Him as our Lord and Saviour*, or in *His three Offices* to Obey Him, as to be *Reconciled and Saved* by Him; and that is as the Scripture elsewhere has it, *to Receive Him*, so as to *walk in Him*.

In one Text we read, that *God was in Christ reconciling the World to Himself, not imputing their Trespases*. In another, *In whom we have Redemption, even Remission of Sins*. In another, that *while we were Sinners, Christ Dyed for us*; and thereupon in the next verse we are said, *as such*, to be *justified by his Blood*, so that the justification by His Blood there is of the same extent with His Dying for us; and that is,

G

while

while we were Sinners, which consequently must be understood of all who have sinned. As there is a Pardon therefore, and the not imputing to the World their Trespases, which is conditional and universal, so is there this Justification by his Blood, preceding (we must know) the Justification by Faith, for Faith is performing the Condition, and makes this Justification and Pardon to be absolute or actual to a singular Person that was conditional to all before. To confirm this Doctrine farther, the Apostle speaking of the manifestation of the Righteousness of God by the Gospel, he thus describes it, *Even the Righteousness of God which is by Faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that Believe, for there is no difference: For all have sinned and come short of the Glory of God, being justified freely by His Grace thro' the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation thro' Faith in his Blood for the Remission of Sins.* Observe here these Words, *Unto all, and Upon all that Believe.* It is manifest by these Words, *Unto all*, that Christ is set forth, and to be set forth as a propitiation thro' Faith in his Blood (that is as the Condition of the Application) to all, I say to every one all alike, as appears expressly by the Words, *For all have sinned, being justified freely thro' the Redemption of Christ, so that here is Redemption by Christ, and free Justification proclaimed both as one, to be Universal; to wit, as to the Acquisition.* The all that have sinned, and the freely justified being of equal extent in the place, which being undeniable, must be understood, I say, of a Conditional Justification and Pardon preceding the Actual by Faith: And therefore when he hath said *Unto all* (this propitiation belonging to all) he adds, *and upon all that Believe*, which is in regard (I say) to the Application of it, so as the Believer only does receive the benefit thereof in his actual Justification. All are conditionally Redeemed, Justified, Saved, but the Believer, the sound Believer only actually Redeemed, Justified and Saved. To the same purpose is that in the Acts, *Be it known*

known unto you Men and Brethren, that thro' this Man is Preached to you the forgiveness of Sins. This Remission is to be Preached to all the World, as is plain, to *Men and Brethren*, to Believers, and Unbelievers, a general Pardon thro' Christ's Blood belonging to all upon condition, and then it follows accordingly, *And by him all that Believe are justified*, that is, upon their Faith, which is performing the Condition, they are *actually* Justified, and shall be Saved.

As for such Texts as are alledged against the *Universality* of Redemption, which say we are *redeemed from our vain Conversation, from this present evil World, from Iniquity to be a peculiar People, Zealous of good Works*, and the like, when all are not so, I humbly offer this solution, that they are to be understood in regard to the fruit and consequent thereof; for Christ having procured out Redemption, Pardon, Justification and Salvation upon the terms of the Gospel, or conforming to it, the leaving such *vain* and *worldly* Conversation, forsaking our Sins, and a Holy Life becoming necessary to reap those Benefits, and which therefore they that partake thereof do, or must endeavour to attain as the terms to be performed, they are said to be Redeem'd from their *Sins*, from their *vain Conversation*, from the *World*, and to be a Holy People upon that account; which in short comes to this, that the *Acquisition* for all is consistent with, and in order to the *Application* made by some only. We have yet two other Answers. The one is by that double *Redemption* which is made commonly by our Practical Divines. There is a Redemption (say they) by *Price*, or a Redemption by *Power*. The Price now I will assume is paid for all. The *Price* is laid down at Christ's *Death*, and He Dyed for *all*, 2 Cor. 5. 14. For *every Man*, Heb. 2. 9. For the *World*, Jo. 3. 16. 1 *Joh*. 2. 2. The *Power* is received at His *Rising again*, Matt. 28, 18. And that I confess, is put forth to this Effect, upon those only who are *given him of his Father* (Jo. 17. 9.) those that are thereby made *His Sheep* (Jo.

10. 17, and 26.) His *Spiritual Seed*, the *Spiritual Israel*, (*Act.* 3. 25. 26. *Act.* 5. 31.) And thus the *Acquisition* which is by *Price*, does still belong to *all*, when the *Application* which is by *Power* to the *Elect* only. The other Answer is, by distinguishing between the *End* of our *Redemption* and the *Intention* of the *Redeemer*. There is *finis operis* & *finis operantis*. There is *finis Redemptionis* & *finis Redimentis*, or *Redemptoris*. The end of Christ's *Redemption* is the acquisition of Pardon and Salvation for all Mankind upon the condition of the Gospel: the end or intention of the *Redeemer* is that thus much being obtained, those Persons whom he ordains to be his *Sheep*, shall perform that Condition, and reap the Benefit. The end of *Redemption* is to procure an *Act* of *Grace* or *Oblivion*, that is, a *General Pardon* for all the *World*; so that whosoever Repents and Believes shall be Pardon'd and Sav'd, without exception of any: The intention of the *Redeemer* is farther, to give that *Grace* to some as he pleases to work in them that *Qualification* according to the *Act*, which gives a right to the Pardon and Life that is purchased for all so qualified. The one of these is necessary, that such a Rule be set (*Norma Judicii* & *Officii*) as that *God* who is *Reffor*, and *Christ* who is *Judg*, may, as such, deal equally with all the *World*; and yet as *absolute Lord* also and *Benefactor*, he may be free in bestowing his *Grace* fit, that when all are put to *work out their Salvation with fear and trembling*, and have common and sufficient *Grace* and *Power* thereunto, yet may he give *more Grace*, or that which is *special* to work in some, both to *will* and to *do* of his *good pleasure*. These are such whom Christ means, when he says, *Many are Called, and few Chosen*. But for the contrary way the Dr goes, the Doctrine thereof is really so intricate and hard to be understood, with respect to practise, and withal, so dangerous to be Preached to any People, unless there has been some work of the Law first upon their Hearts, that I see not how it can be avoided, but their Hearers are like to

be

be lead into *presumption* or *desperation*. If they believe they are *Elect* before such a work of conviction, and such as amounts to an effectual Call, it is presumption: if they believe they are not *Elect*, let them do or not do, they must despair, seeing there is no Redemption, Pardon, and Salvation (no not conditional according to him) procured by Jesus Christ for any, but the *Elect* only.

On the contrary, in our way, the Door is still kept open unto hope and endeavour; for though a Man knows not whether he be *Elect* or no, yet so long as Salvation is procured for all upon the conditions of the Gospel, he knows that if he obey the Gospel, he shall be Saved.

Sect. XI.

I Return to my Point. Against an *Imputation* in the *Effects*, I have heard two things said. The one is, Christ's Righteousness *it self*, and not the *Effects* are imputed, therefore it is not *imputed in the Effects*. *Ans.* By, *in the Effects*, we mean *quoad Effectus*, so that this Objection is but a Mist. It is true then the *Effects* are *ours*, and not *imputed*. A thing cannot be said to be imputed to a Man which he has, unless it be for another thing than what it is (as *Faith is imputed for Righteousness*) or for another end than that he should have it (as *Sin is imputed* that it should be *punished*); neither of which have place here as to the *Effects*, which are really ours: But Christ's Righteousness, which is a thing we have not, may be said to be, and is imputed to us that we may have it; But how? Not *in its self* (which is impossible) but to *the end* it was performed; that is, in the Benefits of it. The other Objection is, when a Man believes, God impures to him Christ's Righteousness, and then he hath the Benefits. His Righteousness is first imputed before he hath the Benefits, and therefore it must be imputed *in its self*. *Ans.* God's Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to a Man,

Man, is his reckoning or accounting it to be *his* according to our opposers. But the Righteousness which is Christ's, that is an *Accident* in him as its *Subject*, cannot be in *another* according to the rules in *Logick*, and God cannot reckon it so, because his reckoning must be according to truth. This imputation we must know then is not of the thing as ours *absolutely*, or *in se* (which is all one) but *respectively* or *relatively* in regard to the *Effects*; and *Relata* being *simul natura*, the *Imputation* and the *Effects* (in regard to which alone it is imputed) must be *simul*. The imputation is not before the *Effects* (as is surmised) nor the *Effects* before the imputation, but they are *simul*, because Christ's Righteousness can be (or be accounted) ours *Relatively* only. As no Man is a Father without, or before he hath a Son, or a Son without a Father, so is it here. And as it is true that the *Axiom*, *Relata sunt simul natura* must be understood *quoad consecutionem* (as *Logicians* speak) when *quoad causationem*, the Father is before the Son: So is Christ's Righteousness as the Cause (the *Meritorious Cause*) of the Benefits, indeed before them, but is not *imputed* (the *Imputation* being *Relative*) before them; the *Imputation* and the *Effects* *quoad consecutionem* are *simul*, neither of them one before, or without the other. And having now said this for vindication of an *Imputation in the Effects*, I have a word more to say against an *Imputation in se*; which is this: For a thing to be a Mans, and to be *imputed* to a Man; that is to be his *in se*, and to be his only to an end, use, or benefit, are two things. An *Imputation* then *in se* is an *Impossible*, because that thing which is diverse from another, cannot be the same thing from which it is diverse. This in our case where Christ's Righteousness is imputed for Pardon and Life, is as good as *Demonstration*. It is true, that a thing may be a Mans *in se absolutely*, and yet his also to such an end, because he may use it to any end; but to be his only to such an end, use, or benefit, and yet be his *in se absolutely*,

is a contradiction. As if the having a House for my Rent to live in, and so being mine for this use, did make me the Proprietor and Landlord of it. When Mr. Baxter denies that Christ's Righteousness is imputed *in se*, or accounted of God to be ours, he understands it so, as that if it were ours *in se*, it should be the formal cause of our Justification, upon which account he denies it; so that his *in se* is all one, out of doubt, with *simply, absolutely, to all purposes*; and if Mr. W. then shall distinguish, and say, that an *in se* may be taken *absolutely*, and so he agrees with Mr. Baxter in the denial of an *Imputation in se*; or *in se* may be taken *Relatively*, and so he holds an *in se* only, in relation to the Effects, this distinction (which commits a rape on the Phrase *in se*) cannot by us, who understand *In se* and *Absolutely* to be all one, be allowed, because it is a Contradiction. Besides if this be admitted, that Christ's Righteousness may be given, and be ours *in se*, and yet given only to an end or use, the Adversary may assume this, and say, The end and use for which it is given, is to be our formal Righteousness to justify us, and then object whatsoever you can, they will say the end it is given for, is not thus or thus as you object, but thus altogether as we hold it, and so can they never be answered. I do think fit therefore to note here that whereas Mr. H. in his *Right of God*, p. 33. and in his *Ult. Man*, p. 5. does say, that what Christ did and suffered, being verily reckoned of God to be in our stead, *it may be said imputed in se as to the Impetration of the Benefits we have by him though not in the Application*, he lets us know in his later Book (*Animad. p. 27.*) that *this having passed him unawares* (for want of a due sense of the Word *Impute*) *he does retract it*. And this is but right, honest, and no shame, for Redemption being Universal, if that which Christ did and suffered is by God imputed to all the World as theirs *in se*, then must Christ (according to the Adversary) have acted as all Mankind's legal Person, and the whole World be Saved without any

any other Performance. As for the *Application* then I say, if God imputes to *Peter* Christ's Righteousness *in se*, then he must account it to be his *in se*; and if he account it his *in se*, it must be his *in se*; and if it be *Peter's in se*, it cannot be *John's* and *James's*; though you put the word *Legally* (so as to go all along) to that which is spoken. There is therefore no Imputation of it *in se* to any, but *quoad Effectus*, and thereby it is *John's*, and *ours*, upon Believing, as well as *Peter's*; that is, *John*, and we, and *Peter* are alike Pardoned and Saved.

Unto this, against an *Imputation in se*, because it is that which is my main concern, as I have said thus much for Mr. *H.* in his *verbal* difference with Mr. *W.* I do think fit in the *real* difference, that both Mr. *W.* and Mr. *H.* have with the Dr, to add those Arguments, from the consequents thereof, for every considerat Man that can, to draw them out to their Improvement, which are in one of Mr. *H's* Books as followeth. If Christ's Righteousness be so imputed as that *Legally*, or according to Law it be ours *in se*, or so to be accounted (by God and by us), Then need not we obey at all; Then should not we suffer at all, or be punished for any Sin, for he that in Law hath perfectly obeyed, can be punished for nothing; Then should we need no farther Forgiveness, and when once Believers give over saying the *Lord's Prayer*; Then must Christ's Sufferings for us be needless, seeing no Sin of Omision or Commission could be laid to our charge; Then must Christ be lookt on by God as a Sinner for such as is the imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us, such must be the imputation of our Sins to him, As we are *Righteous* in his Person, he must be a *sinner* in ours; Then must the *Culpa* as well as the *Pena* be imputed to him; Then should Impunity and Life be due to us without the interposition of a new Law or Covenant, and so the Gospel is quite overturn'd by this Opinion. Once more, If Christ suffered in our Person, then should he have born the same sufferings, and not those only he did *in stead of ours*. And so I have done.

For

For a Conclusion then, I have read the Dr's Book and those he opposes, I have read much of Mr. *Baxter's* Works, I have read Mr. *Clark's* Book, and I have more particularly read Mr *Humfreys's* Books all over, and the Redemption we have by Christ being presupposed, Satisfaction made, and the Gospel Preached as that Doctrin according to which we shall be Judged, the result thereof, as *Totius de Justificatione disputationis ejus Symbolum* I will now set down as well as I can cast it up, and commit to the consideration both of Friends and Adversaries, for their Reception, or Emendation; and it is this:

THE Believer is *Justified* and *Sanctified*, and these different things; but not so, as if a Man was Righteous with an *imperfect* Righteousness, and God looks on him so (that is, repures him as he is), and Righteous also with a *perfect* Righteousness, and God looks on him so likewise; which is the Absurdity of an *Imputation in se*, or the common Doctrin, as if he had *one* Righteousness of his *own*, and *another* of *Christ's*, and both *formally* his; one in *Reality*, and the other by *Imputation*: whereas the Man truly and really hath Faith, Repentance, sincere Obedience, and this is his Righteousness, and but *one* Righteousness (the Righteousness of *Justification*, and the Righteousness of *Sanctification*, though *formally* different, being *materially* one) call'd in Scripture, the *Righteousness of God*, or *Righteousness of Faith*, viz. *Evangelical Righteousness*; but this one and the same Righteousness that *sanctifies* him (not *Christ's* Righteousness) is that which is *imputed for Righteousness*, and so *justifies* him also (this *Faith*, or the Evangelical Condition performed, being the *Matter*, and God's *Imputation* the *Form*); and the said *Imputing it for Righteousness*, is God's accepting thereof (thro' *Christ's* Merit, or for *Christ's* Sake, or through his Righteousness as the Meritorious cause) instead of the

H perfect

perfect Righteousness which the Law required, and so stands him in the same stead as if that were fulfilled, though God knows, judges, reputes it imperfect as it is; upon which account, the *Reward* thereof is not of *Debt*, but of *Grace*.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A

Page 9. l. 13. for *spouſion* r. *ſponſion*. l. 34. for *merham* r. *meritum*. P. 12. l. 12. for *que ad r. quoad*. P. 35. l. 2. for *that* r. *thus*. P. 46. l. 1. for *not ad r. not at*. l. 12. blot out the first *but*. P. 47. l. 8. for *Booki* r. *Book*.

A Post-script.

Reader,

THERE are two or three Things I am yet to acquaint thee with, now my Work is done.

The first is, Whereas in the late Book of Bishop *Stillingfleet* which the Dr impugnes, there was one Chapter intended to shew, *The true Notion of imputed Righteousness, and our Justification thereby*; which is a matter, wherein I suppose thou canst not but desire to know his Judgment; but the Book being put out since his Death, as imperfect (which hath been mentioned) there is nothing said of it, for that Chapter he was not come to, unto which it was reserved. I cannot therefore but think it like to be a very acceptable thing to thee, to let thee understand this Learned Man's mind about it, which he having opened in a Letter wrote to Mr. *H.* in the Year 1697. with his consent for him to Publish; I think it fit to give thee notice, that it is Printed and prefixed to that Book of Mr. *H.* Entituled, *The Righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel*. In the latter end of that Letter (as you may see there) the Bishop concludes thus: *The Righteousness of Christ may be said to be imputed two ways. 1. So as it becomes our Personal Righteousness, which is called Formal Imputation. 2. So, as the Benefits of Christ's Righteousness and Satisfaction redound to our Advantage. If the former sense be allowed (he goes on), these Consequences follow. 1. That we must be as Righteous as Christ was. 2. That there can be no Remission of Sin. 3. That there can be no Conditions required.* These Consequences he enlarges upon, and are indeed such as are usually urged. In the latter sense then it is the Bishop holds this Imputation, and that is all one with Mr. *H.* and Mr. *Baxter*, to be not *in se*, but in regard to the *Effects* only.

A Second thing is, whereas the Adversaries of our Doctrin accuse it hereupon, as laying aside the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness,

H 2

ousness,

ousness, I observe what is said to this by the Author of that late Book which hath the *Title*, of that *Chapter* given it, (and for that reason) which the *Bishop* left unhandled now mentioned. *Touching Christ's Righteousness* (saith he, p. 216.) and the *Imputation* thereof, I affirm, God so far imputes it, as to account it, 1. To be for our *Redemption and Salvation*. 2. To be the sole and only *Merit and Purchase* of the *New Covenant*. 3. To be the *Merit* of the blessed Spirit to work *Grace*. 4. That it is for this all the *Duties and Grace* of his People are accepted. 5. That for this he accounts our *Faith* for *Righteousness*, *Justifies* us, and *Pardons* us. 6. That what *Christ* did and suffered as *Mediator*, doth and shall avail as much for obtaining the *Benefits*, as though we had done and suffered in our own Persons. I will add Mr. W's. *Imputation* of it to be our pleadable security for the same: All which is manifestly an *Imputation* still *quoad fructus aut effectus*; and when so much is allowed to the common Protestant, Why should he contend for more? Why should he proceed to Absurdity, or Antinomianism? And what better or fairer *Constructi- ons* then, can be made of what is said by our former Divines, than that of the *Advertisement* in that Book; which is, that agreeing in this, that there is indeed, an *Imputation* of *Christ's Righteousness* to Believers, but (because, it is not express in Scripture) not considering, or not mentioning any such distinction, they are misconstrued, to understand an *imputation* in se, when there is; and can be no such, but in the *Effects* only.

A Third thing is, whereas I am sensible by my writing these *Sheets*, I shall give occasion to some of reading the Dr's Book, who would not else have read it, and it may be thought therefore better to have let it alone, I will give my reason to the contrary.

It is the Command of *Christ* that we love our *Enemies*, and much more only an *Opponent* Brother; and here is such a one who hath written Books, and I never regarded them through prejudice, and so others: But now a Book coming out that concerns me, I read it, and find in it more *Learning*, more *acuteness*, as well as a more *lowe* slighting of what Mr. H. hath wrote, than I expected from him. There is wrong done therefore to this Brother's Reputation, when Parts and Worth are undervalued even to neglect; and it is an Office of *Charity*, due in justice, and the more ingenuous for me than another to do, (and to set) him right, in speaking

ing of him the same things I should, if he had writ for the Person, whom he hath writ against. I do approve my self herein (that is my *Conscience*, or *Genius* does) so much, as it is not any *displeasure from without* can countervail, if there be any.

But there is more reason than barely to shew that I have no Gall (nor any spartlings of it in my Pen) against the Dr, for my being willing to have his Book read. The Dr is a Man true to his Opinion, and honest in that regard above others; so that when Mr. *Lobb* in his declaring against *Antinomianism*, and shifting about such consequences of his own Doctrin that lead to it, was brought to that pass (as I apprehend) that he must have come over to Mr. *Baxter*, or gone farther (that way which he declined) than he would: the Dr himself owning those Consequences to the utmost he can, does let the World see, that if any will maintain the Common Protestant Opinion they must go as far as he; and how far that is, does appear by what Mr. *Williams* in his *Defence of Gospel Truth* against him, hath cited with temper, and without abuse. The truth is, there is no *Midling* it between the *Antinomian* and the Doctrin of Mr. *Baxter*, and when all we urge, or all our Arguments, resolve into this mainly, to evince that the Common Protestant must receive our Doctrin, or else wheel into *Antinomianism*, the Books of this Dr may be a full testimony; who having spoken more shrewdly than any of them for the Common Opinion, so that they can desire no more to be said, they must see by him whether it tends; which gives me ground to judg, that the more the Point is weighed, and the more his Works be read, we shall have more Converts to Mr. *Baxter's* Judgment.

Besides this, I am willing to let the World know me to be content, that the *Truth* if it were on the Dr's side (as I think it is on ours) should be embraced; who am one (I must confess) that put on these *Controversial Opinions* as I do my *Cloaths*; if they pinch me any where, I will mend them; and if they wont serve, I will change them: Whereas others I see, have their Opinions on them as their *Skin*, so that if you Write against them, they take it as if you went to tear away their Flesh, and are in grievous pain, being ready to hate you, if you be not of their mind. God thro' mercy hath spirited me otherwise to Write these Sheets, which I would not have any mistake for *Pike*, or an *Answer* to the Dr's Book, being intended for some occasional Notes only touching the chief

chief Design, as appears by my *Tiſte*. There are others, who have more critical Learning, and are fitter for it, may do that Work, if his Book amounts to ſo much credit, as to provoke it.

There is a *Righteouſneſs of God* (to wit, of his Ordination) revealed in the *Gospel* whereby we are juſtified, and that this *Righteouſneſs of God* is not the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* who is God, becauſe this *Righteouſneſs of God* is a *Righteouſneſs without the Law*, but *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* is a *Righteouſneſs according to the Law* is the Argument of one Mr. H's Books. But now the *Righteouſneſs of God without the Law* is manifeſted. This Argument is that which did at firſt convince Mr. H, and it does ſtill convince me, ſeeing there is nothing but ſome inſignificant Put off is by the Dr, or can be by any ſaid to it. I argue therefore again (though not quite in form, yet as to the matter, which only I ſtand upon): This *Righteouſneſs of God* is declared to be a *Righteouſneſs* ſet forth in the *Gospel* in oppoſition to the *Works of the Law*, or to a *Righteouſneſs of Works*. But *Chriſt's Righteouſneſs* conſiſts in a full and perfect performance of the *Law of Works*, as part of the *Commandment of his Father*, or *Law of Mediation*. Therefore the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* is not this *Righteouſneſs of God*, or *Righteouſneſs of the Gospel*; but *Faith* is this *Righteouſneſs* according to the *Apoſtle*, which he every where oppoſes to *Works*, and every where ſays, we are juſtified by it.

Reader, I have a Leaf yet to ſpare, and I will not let the Bookseller fill it with the names of books to benefit his ſhop, but uſe it rather for ſomething to benefit thy *Soul*. I will adviſe thee therefore, in *Doctrinal* points to conſider always which ſide tends moſt to *Piety*, and (if thy judgement will let thee) to chooſe that. And to the end I may employ thy mind better than I have hitherto in controverſy, my laſt words ſhall be to ſet thee upon *Practiſe*. Thou art one I will ſuppoſe, that deſires to be found a true penitent believer, and a ſincere Chriſtian, ſeeing elſe thou canſt not be juſtified, (which is our point in debate), and I having the liberty to fill this leaf with what I will, though it were beſides the matter; I will cloſe my book, and the writings of one, who is now juſt fourſcore years of age this *January*, with theſe few ſhort general Chriſtian *Directions*. The good Lord vouchſafe to the *Writer*, as to thee a heart, and his Grace, to follow what we ought, ſo our lives end.

1. **B**E sure thou never givest thy Soul any quiet, until thou bringest it up to a sound, and settled *Resolution* to renounce the *Will* of the *Flesh*, and to submit to the *Will* of *God*.

2. Having brought up thy heart unto this in some measure, see that thou walkest in a deep sence of the *Majesty* of *Heaven*, that no sin may seem *little* to thee, that is an offence against the *great* Invisible and All-seeing God.

3 Be diligent, constant and serious in attendanee on the *Holy Ordinances*, which are not onely the *Shops* unto which we must go to get *Oyle* for our *Lamps* when they are going out, but the *Vessels* that conveigh to us the *blood* and *water* that must cleanse us from our sins.

4 Be very fearful to enter into any *Communication* (as Eve) with any *Temptation*, rejecting it, if thou canst at the first motion : but if sin does so beset thee, that thou must needs enter the list with it, remember thou fightest for thy life ; keep thy ground, and give not place to the Devil.

5. If through humane frailty thou canst not keep thy self from receiving some *foyles* sometimes by thy *Corruptions*, be sure to recover thy self as quick as thou canst by *Repentance* : Lye not a minute wounded without healing, but as soon as sin hath thrown thee on thy *face*, get up again upon thy *Knees* begging pardon, and fresh assistance against the same.

6 Live much in *Communion* with *God*, and the *life* of *Faith*, and that will hinder the *life* of *Sin*.

7. Be thou one that art true to thy self, in the *Examination* thou makest, the *Watch* that thou settest, and the *Evidence* thou gettest, concerning thy *State*, over thy *Heart*, and of thy *Salvation*.

Deo gloria, Mihi condonatio.

Amen.